Wheat-Bowen, Elliott

An analysis of football-related violence by England and Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

Original Citation

Wheat-Bowen, Elliott (2018) An analysis of football-related violence by England and Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship. Masters thesis, University of Huddersfield.

This version is available at http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/34605/

An analysis of football-related violence by England and Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

Elliott George Wheat-Bowen

A thesis submitted to the University of Huddersfield in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of MSc by Research (Political and International Studies)

May 2018

This project examines football-related violence by providing an analysis of media portrayals of football-related violence by England and Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship. When incidences of football-related violence began to occur at the tournament, the complex and dynamic phenomenon rose in salience and returned to the fore. Whilst most of the dominant views on the subject came from the second half of the last century, the incidences of violence at Euro 2016 appeared to go beyond the peculiarities of the heavily structured British social class system which the early established schools of thought are heavily reliant upon. Building on Stuart Hall's mass media approach, this project argues that the 2016 European Championship was a demonstration that the mass media, through amplification, holds the influence to frame the discussion and most importantly the perception of football-related violence at elite level as well as for the general population. Through the chronological examination of a selection of print media sources, the themes of securitisation, cultural differences, sensationalisation and amplification are explored. It is from the findings of this examination that the ways in which the media's influence amplifies the phenomenon are highlighted. This project concludes by exploring some of the wider implications of this research both in policy terms and as potential future avenues of research, specifically the management of crowds at future major sporting events and how the influence the mass media holds must be taken into account and subject to much greater scrutiny.

Table of Contents

An analysis of football-related violence by England and
Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

An analysis of football-related violence by England and
Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

Introduction

This project examines football-related violence's rise back to prominence at the 2016 European Championship (Euro 2016), in spite of the perceived decline of football-related violence. To understand how football-related violence returned to prominence and more broadly, the relationship between football-related violence and the mass media, this project has identified a number of aims and objectives. The main aim of this project is to provide an analysis of media portrayals of football-related violence by England and Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship. To achieve this main aim, three objectives have been identified.

The first objective is to provide the necessary theoretical context for the remainder of this project. To achieve this objective, the relevant existing literature is explored. The theoretical context of football-related violence is extensive. There are various academic perspectives that are specifically based on football-related violence, these perspectives include the Marxist, Figurationalist and Ethnogenic schools of thought. However, whilst these early schools of thought are regarded to be the dominant positions on the subject of football-related violence, the incidences of football-related violence at Euro 2016 went beyond the peculiarities of the heavily structured British social class system which these perspectives are heavily reliant upon. Instead, this project is more aligned with Stuart Hall's mass media approach and the focus on media portrayals of football-related violence throughout Euro 2016 is reflective of that.

The second objective is to identify the most appropriate methodological choices for the facilitation of analysis. For this research, the project is based on the analysis of a selection of print media sources, drawn from liberal, centrist and conservative media outlets. When selecting the sources, there was several criteria for the inclusion and exclusions of sources which included the editorial biases of each of the print media outlets which were taken into consideration to ensure that there was a balance. The further justification for the choices made are provided within the Methodology chapter.

The third and final objective is to, through a combination of process-tracing and media content analysis, examine and analyse the media coverage in the selected sources prior to the tournament; of the incidences of football-related violence and in the aftermath of these incidents

An analysis of football-related violence by England and Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

with the specific focus being on football-related violence and its relationship with the media, through the themes of: securitisation, cultural differences, sensationalisation and amplification.

Throughout the coverage of Euro 2016, this project makes the argument that the relationship between football-related violence and the mass media, specifically the increasing influence of the media, led to the amplification of the phenomenon in a number of ways.

In the build-up to the tournament, the focus of the media was on the perceived threat of terrorism as part of a wider securitised approach taken for the continental tournament. Through the reporting of foiled plots and potential attacks, the dramatisation of the threat of terrorism to amplify fears was the means in which the media fuelled and supported a securitised response. This project makes the case that the ideological convergence by the media in support of a problematic securitised response inadvertently contributed towards lapses in security as the primary focus was on the threat of terrorism, leading to a collective oversight on the issue of football-related violence.

However, whilst there was a convergence between the media and the policy establishment in support of a securitised response, a paradox emerged, between the two, when the securitised response began to be operationally implemented during the tournament. Rather than supporting this operational implementation, the media cross-examined and subsequently condemned the French police response to the incidences of violence, despite the operational implementation being in accordance with the securitised response.

The decision made by a number of media outlets to cross-examine the French police response, which included comparisons drawn between the French approach and the successful approaches of Britain and Portugal, led to the amplification of the phenomenon. The global attention given to the French police's robust reaction raised awareness to the perceived injustices being made against football fans which inadvertently amplified the deviant act by uniting football fans in opposition to the French police.

Finally, in the aftermath of the incidences of violence by England and Russia fans, the coverage of the media turned to the responses of the two states. It is during this section that the actions of various elites of both states are highlighted as they each attempt to use the media as a platform to vindicate themselves and apportion blame either to their opponents or to the media itself.

An analysis of football-related violence by England and Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

This section also directly explores instances of sensationalisation and amplification from throughout the media coverage of the European Championship.

This project concludes by highlighting some of the wider implications of this research which can be taken into consideration for future reference as potential future avenues of research. The overall argument is that the 2016 European Championship was a demonstration of how the media holds the influence, through amplification, to frame the perception and discussion of football-related violence at elite level as well as for the general population, because of this, the media must be subject to greater scrutiny.

Literature Review Chapter

This literature review will explore how existing research has framed the debate around the social phenomenon of football-related violence. The initial focus is on the critical debate surrounding the definition of football-related violence. After defining the phenomenon, the focus turns to the schools of thought that attempt to explain why football-related violence occurs, beginning with the early Marxist approaches. Then, this review will explore in turn: the Leicester School's Figurational approach; the Mass Media approach provided by Stuart Hall; and the Ethnogenic approach based on Peter Marsh's work. The attention of this review will finally turn to the theme of Securitisation, which provides the theoretical basis for the response to the violence at Euro 2016. The overall aim is to provide the necessary theoretical understanding for the remainder of this research project by exploring the current literature and explaining the contribution to that literature made by this research.

Defining Football-Related Violence

The first point of contention surrounds the definition of football-related violence. Throughout this research project, it may also be referred to as football hooliganism however this label "is not so much a social scientific or social psychological concept" (Dunning et al., 2002: p.142) as politicians and the mass media have created this label. Without a legal definition to provide a skeleton framework, this essentially contested concept lacks a "single universally adopted definition" (Frosdick & Marsh, 2005: p.78). This has led to confusion and inconsistencies among scholars.

To understand further the complex critical argument surrounding the definition of football-related violence, Ramon Spaaij (2007) identifies conceptual dilemmas which incorporate some of the perspectives of schools of thought which will be discussed. The first such dilemma is that "violent behaviour is not restricted to inter-group fighting but may include missile throwing, vandalism, attacks on police or non-hooligan supporters" (Spaaij, 2007: p.413). This supports the broader argument that football-related violence encompasses a wide variety of activities (Canter et al, 1989: p.108).

An analysis of football-related violence by England and Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

Another conceptual dilemma is that "violent behaviour of hooligan groups takes place not only at or in the immediate vicinity of football grounds" (Spaaij, 2007: p.414). This complicates defining football-related violence as it has to incorporate a broader context. Spaaij also contends that "symbolic opposition and ritualized aggression [...] is easily confused with 'real' violence" (Spaaij, 2007: p.414). This conceptual dilemma coincides with Peter Marsh's work which will be explored in further detail below. These conceptual dilemmas demonstrate that there are many ambiguities and caveats which complicates defining football-related violence.

These ambiguities are reflected in the wide "variety of forms of behaviour which take place in more or less directly football-related contexts" (Dunning, 2000: p.142). These forms of behaviour fall into the category of football-related violence despite the context not necessarily being football-related. Rather than a precise clarified definition, football-related violence therefore becomes an umbrella term to encompass many form of "behaviours, both simple and complex" (Canter et al, 1989: p.108). Therefore, although it lacks a precise definition, this research project understands football-related violence to be an umbrella term to describe behaviour and acts of an anti-social or violent nature carried out by individuals or groups of football spectators.

The Early Approaches

Early academic approaches exploring football-related violence were provided by Ian Taylor and John Clarke. Both academics provide a Marxist perspective, with Clarke specifically focusing on Subcultural Marxism. In response to the controversial Harrington Report of 1968 which cited individual psychological factors as the cause of football-related violence (Harrington & Trethowan, 1968: p.16), Taylor proposed an alternative explanation for why football-related violence occurred.

Building on the belief that in "the early days of professional soccer, […] (the) membership of a sub-culture concerned with the welfare of a particular team was in a sense the membership of a localized but highly significant 'participatory democracy'" (Taylor, 1971a: p.143), Taylor's explanation is based on the erosion of participatory democracy coinciding with the dismantlement of the working-class. As well as these broader societal changes, Taylor and Clarke argue that there was also a process in which football, as a sport, evolved and changed.

To understand Taylor's explanation, it is first important to explain his interpretation of the relationship between the working-class and the football club and how that has evolved over time. "In a period of low geographical and social mobility […] soccer teams- were highly localized and very much the result of initiatives in the particular sub-cultures of the class" (Taylor, 1971a: p.141). He argues that initially there was a sub-culture of soccer, a "working-class community (which) refers to the groups of working men bound together with a concern for the game in general (the soccer consciousness) and the local team in particular" (Taylor, 1971a: p.142). This provides the foundation of knowledge to support Taylor's claim that football clubs were at the heart of the community and the facilitator of participatory democracy for working-class subcultures.

However, Taylor argues that a number of changes and processes over time led to the conclusion that "professional soccer is no longer a participatory democracy" (Taylor, 1971a: p.143). Football clubs' departure away from being a 'participatory democracy' was a by-product of the bourgeoisification of the sport. The term bourgeoisification was described by Taylor as "the changes introduced by the football authorities from the late 1950s onwards in an attempt to attract a middle-class and 'affluent worker' audience to the game" (Dunning et al., 1988: p.24). However, Taylor's argument is not wholly applicable in modern contemporary football culture. Some football clubs remain heavily localised especially in non-league football, the grassroots connection between the core demographic of fans and the club remains.

When discussing bourgeoisification, Taylor argues a by-product of the process of professionalisation was that "the idea of the 'true' soccer supporter transformed – at least in the eyes of soccer's powerful and the mass media at large" (Taylor, 1971a: p.143-144). This transformation of the game itself and more significantly the perception of who the 'true' football supporter was, had begun to shift away from the typical working-class supporter (Dunning & Elias, 1971: p.364). This led to a state of alienation for the working-class supporters as they felt both their control and significance begin to dwindle as the 'participatory democracy' perpetuated by football clubs became obsolete.

Coinciding with the professionalisation process, Taylor argues there was also a process of institutionalisation which saw the increasingly professionalised sport become organised and highly structured with the control moving from the hands of the working-class supporters and the 'subculture of soccer' to the footballing authorities. As "the Leagues themselves expanded to

encompass the growing number of clubs being created in the working-class communities of England, these divisions of labour became more permanent features of club organization" (Taylor, 1971a: p.144). The process of institutionalisation drew attention to these divisions of labour as did "the changed relationship between managers and players (which) created social distance and minimized contact between the supporter and the player" (Taylor, 1971a: p.148). However, whilst direct contact between the supporter and the player may have been minimalised, different avenues of contact emerged primarily through social media. Despite this, Taylor argued that the process of institutionalisation was one of the prime causes of the erosion of 'participatory democracy' within football.

Taylor argues that alongside the erosion of 'participatory democracy' within football lies "'the decomposition of the working-class itself'" (Dunning et al., 1988: p.27). The diversification of the working-class into different strata became increasingly visible as the formation of "an 'under-class' (was) looked on with a combination of hostility, contempt and fear by those who remain in employment" (Dunning et al., 1988: p.27). The emergence of organised football-related violence particularly "'football gangs', he argues, come from this deprived and 'disorganized' under-class" (Dunning et al., 1988: p.27).

The decomposition of the working-class saw the emergence of a subcultural rump. This was an alienated group of people "in British society most directly affected by absolute or relative material deprivation" (Taylor, 1971b: p.367) which was a result of broader capitalist changes within Britain. Whilst within Marxist ideology, there are four types of alienation, Marx's distinction that "a direct consequence of the alienation of man from the product of his labour, from his life activity and from his species-life […] man is alienated from his species-life means that each man is alienated from others" (Marx, 1964: p.17) is the interpretation of the concept used by Taylor. Taylor argues that the working-class subculture is alienated by those who are employed and also the new affluent audience. This sense of alienation amongst the working-class subculture is the reason that Taylor offers to explain why football-related violence occurs.

Despite providing one of the first in-depth academic sociological explanations of why football-related violence occurs, Taylor's work has been heavily criticised by fellow academics. One of the key arguments proposed by Taylor is based on the belief that football clubs acted as a 'participatory democracy', however, Murphy et al. (1990) describe this as the "weaker version of his thesis" (p.39). Furthermore, Dunning et al. (1988) argues that this belief was based on "a

thesis that is produced with no empirical evidence to support it" (p.30). The lack of empirical evidence leads to Dunning (2000) describing Taylor's approach as "impressionistic, non-research-based analysis" (p.148). Similarly, Giulianotti (1999) argues that "the major weakness in Taylor's work is its lack of empirical grounding. He readily accepted in the early 1970s that his writings were 'speculative' and not based on real fieldwork" (p.42). As a result of Taylor's speculative findings, Frosdick & Marsh (2005) argue that there is a lack of empirical evidence as "the implied underlying motivation of football hooligans has also been absent from accounts of football fans themselves" (p.90), therefore, the Marxist justification for football-related violence is lacking the evidence to support the claim. This assessment of Taylor's flawed methodological approach hinders the validity and reliability of Taylor's findings as it lacks the necessary empirical content.

Building on Taylor's work, a school of thought attempted to understand football-related violence through a Subcultural Marxist perspective. Originating from the Contemporary Cultural Studies department of the University of Birmingham, its main exponent was John Clarke.

As it was also Marxist in approach, similarities can be drawn between Clarke and Taylor. Both scholars examine the relationship between the working-class and football. Clarke argues that the composition of the sport is clearly visible as "the grounds of the long-standing league clubs are almost all located in working class areas" (Clarke, 1978: p.40). The connection between working-class areas and traditional football clubs has "played a significant role in the development of English working-class culture, and football has drawn on […] these local identities and rivalries" (Clarke, 1978: p.41). These local identities and rivalries remain and can still be seen in contemporary footballing culture.

However, as "the development of English working-class culture coincided with the Industrial Revolution, football became an alternative to industrialised life" (Clarke, 1973: p.1). Therefore, in response to "a life dominated by the controls, orders and instructions of Hoggart's 'Them', leisure outlets are one possible way of finding opportunities of freedom of choice. Football […] has always been susceptible to at least a belief in control by fans" (Clarke, 1973: p.3-4). Clarke's reference to Hoggart's concept of 'them' can be understood as 'us' being the working-class and 'them' being "the world of the bosses, whether those bosses are private individuals, or as it is increasingly the case today, public officials" (Hoggart, 1992: p.72). This has further implications as the working-class attempts to distance themselves from the authorities and

bureaucracy that run the world (Owen, 2008: p.174). This means that rather than through work, "specific subcultural styles enable young working-class males to resolve essential conflicts in their lives. Post-war youth subcultures were all examples of these symbolic attempts to resolve structural and material problems. Football hooliganism […] is one such symbolic attempt" (Spaaij, 2007: p.416).

As well as implying that football-related violence is used to resolve essential conflicts in their lives, Clarke, like Taylor, argues that post-war changes to the sport negatively affect the relationship between football clubs and the working-class. As the composition of the entertainment landscape in Post-war Britain evolved, "Football, it seemed, had to compete for this consumer's business with the other alternatives, it had to become part of the entertainment business" (Clarke, 1978: p.45), this is an example of Clarke taking inspiration from Taylor when developing this thesis.

These changes made by football associations were an attempt to encompass the new audience which was "becoming more selective- more in fact of a consumer and less of a fan" (Clarke, 1978: p.45). The main issue with the spectacularisation of the sport was that "the estimation of the character of the 'new spectators' for football was, like so many other predictions of that period, a miscalculation" (Clarke, 1978: p.50). This miscalculation of the demographics led to the alienation of the core working-class football supporters as "these changes were not so thorough as to kill off class and class differences" (Clarke, 1978: p.50). The working-class response to spectacularisation was "an attempt to defend the culture against the encroachment of the bourgeoisie" (Clarke, 1973: p.13). However, arguments have been made that the working class has shrunk and the significance of social class has diminished (Denver & Garnett, 2014).

Despite this, Clarke's reasoning of why football-related violence occurs goes beyond the backlash against the bourgeoisie. Clarke also links football-related violence to evolving subcultural relationships. In the immediate post-war period subcultural relationships were altered particularly "the relationship of working class youth and their parent culture" (Clarke, 1978: p.51). The parent culture, also known as the parent class, was the generation that introduced young working-class men to football and then continued to take them to matches, as "working class boys went with their fathers, uncles, older brothers or neighbours; in that context, their behaviour was subjective to relatively effective control" (Dunning et al., 1988: p.26). Whilst it is true that football-related violence was subdued in the pre-war period, there was some

An analysis of football-related violence by England and
Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

instances of football-related violence in Britain dating back as far as 1880 (Frosdick & Marsh, 2005: p.16-17) which undermines Clarke claim that the parent culture provided effective control.

However, Clarke continues to argue that young working-class men were not only struggling for control from their employment but also the ever-changing subcultural relationships between the working-class young and the parent culture. This was where compared to other ethnographic approaches, "Clarke added a new dimension of 'inter-generational conflict' reflected in the social and physical separation of young fans" (Armstrong, 1998: p.15) as they attempted to break away from the parent class in search of freedom.

The relative freedom of young working-class men Clarke argues was expressed in the behavioural patterns primarily at football matches. In the post war period, it became increasingly apparent that "the working-class young have become physically and socially separated in the football crowd- a section of the crowd identifiably cut off from the older supporters" (Clarke, 1978: p.52). This clear intergenerational conflict within the football crowd played a notable role in the rise of football-related violence as young working-class men no longer had the tacit controls of the parent class to adhere to.

Instead, Clarke (1978) observed that young working-class men mirrored the conflicts on the pitch in the terraces as "their own collective organisation and activities have created a form of analogy with the match itself. But in their case, it becomes a contest which takes place not on the fields but on the terraces" (Clarke, 1978: p.54). Ritualised aggression resulting in a contest in the terraces is similar to Peter Marsh's ethnographic approach which also argues that football-related violence is a result of ritualised aggression. Clarke further argues, ritualised aggression is because of the relationship between the parent class and the young working-class splintering. This led to the tacit control that the parent class provided being abandoned by the young working-class men which led to football-related violence's occurrence.

Like Taylor's Marxist approach, Clarke has also been accused of shaping his theory around an over-arching ideology and lacking the necessary fieldwork to supply the evidence to fully support his claim. Furthermore, "there is little in Clarke's work at this level, however, to enable us to understand why some individuals choose one particular solution (subculture) than another" (Frosdick & Marsh, 2005: p.91). This theoretical critique crucially undermines the approach as

Clarke is unable to explain why young working-class men turned to football-related violence rather than other subcultures in their search for freedom.

The Figurational Approach

In response to the early Marxist perspectives, a group of academics named the Leicester School attempted to provide an in-depth explanation of why football-related violence occurs. The group decided to take a figurational approach which is "the understanding of the structures that mutually dependent human beings establish, and the transformations they suffer, both individually and in groups, due to the increase or reduction of their interdependencies and gradients of power" (Quintaneiro, 2006: p.3).

Led by sociologist Eric Dunning, the Leicester School drew heavily upon Norbert Elias's 'Civilising Process'. This theory was based on a number of sociogenetic and psychogenetic investigations which came to the conclusion that there was a "lost perception of the long-term psychical process of civilisation- a process involving changes in behaviour and feeling extending over many generations" (Goudsblom, 1994: p.3). The Leicester School applied this theory to provide an explanation to football-related violence in England and particularly to the city of Leicester.

Building on the earlier academic theories of Taylor and Clarke, the Leicester School's focus was predominantly on the working-class, specifically, the aggressive behavioural patterns of the "lower" working-class. These scholars argued that 'ordered segmentation' and 'incorporation', explain why football-related violence occurs.

To explain the aggressive character of the working-class, the Leicester School applied the concept of ordered segmentation. The concept is based on Gerald Suttle's sociological findings in Chicago (Suttle, 1970) in which "Suttle describes a process of ordered segmentation, […] (where) neighbourhood actors negotiate and construct a moral and social order amidst dramatic ethnic, sex, age and territorial segregation" (Short et al, 2006: p.103). The integral observation for the Leicester School that Suttle found was that "while the segments that make up larger neighbourhoods are relatively independent of each other, the members of these segments nevertheless have a tendency regularly to combine in the event of opposition and conflict" (Dunning et al, 1988: p.199). In the case of football-related violence, the segments would have a

geographical composition, however, the division between each segment is differing club allegiance. This creates situations of hostility and tribalism between these segments which causes football-related violence to occur.

However, this integral argument has been criticised as "'ordered segmentation' does not allow for acute temporal and cultural variations in any manifestation of football hooliganism" (Armstrong & Giulianotti, 2002: p.220). As events of opposition and conflict are not fixed, with there being instances of relationships between different segments changing, it is, therefore, difficult to apply the process of ordered segmentation to football-related violence as relationships between different fan groups and factions may fluidly change on a regular basis.

Despite a fundamental flaw in the application of ordered segmentation by the Leicester School, the interpretation that it uses to calibrate the process of ordered segmentation is predominantly class based with the focus being on a "cultural grouping within a wider working-class community; that remains structurally disconnected from the broad sweep of civilizing tendencies" (Best, 2010: p.578). This interpretation of ordered segmentation and how the Leicester School applies it to football-related violence within Britain has led to severe criticism.

The Leicester School's application of ordered segmentation has been heavily criticised for a number of reasons, Armstrong & Giulianotti (2002) argue that "it misunderstands the demographic composition of major club support in general" (p.220), as the theory of ordered segmentation suggests that fan groups are homogeneous entities when in fact, the demographic composition of major club support and the ecological construction of hooligan formations varies in differing circumstances.

This inability to understand the demographic composition of major club support is compounded by "the figurationalists' choice of Leicester for supporting ethnography (as it) leads to a particularly under-developed application of 'ordered segmentation'" (Armstrong & Giulianotti, 2002: p.220). The study of the city of Leicester as, a one club city, limits the Leicester School's ability to provide generalisable statements about football-related violence as it simplifies the complications of football-related violence and rivalries in cities that inhabit more than one football club.

This is visible in Armstrong's anthropological account of Sheffield. Armstrong argues "the 'ordered segmentation' principle was not applicable intra group. Not for a minute would they consider themselves as a homogeneous entity [...] some of this prejudice was geographical" (Armstrong, 1998: p.152). Armstrong's case study of Sheffield, a two-club city, supports the broader point that the Leicester School doesn't fully understand the ecological construction of hooligan formations. This point is particularly stressed as the Leicester School fails to provide a coherent explanation of how ordered segmentation leads to football-related violence which is applicable both transnationally but also across footballing cities and towns of different ecological constructions.

The other concept that the Leicester School uses to explain the aggressive character of the working-class and why football-related violence occurs is incorporation. Dunning et al. describes incorporation as "the constellation of developments which have served over the past century to integrate increasing sections of the working-class into the mainstream of British society" (Dunning et al, 1988: p.227). The concept of incorporation as a long-term social process resulted in the acceptance "of aspects of the values of dominant groups, and as part of this, the increasing degree to which the more 'respectable members of the working class […] in what they took to be a 'civilizing manner'" (Dunning et al, 1988: p.92). This is where sections of the working-class embraced "aspects or variants of the values of the 'hegemonic' upper and middle classes" (Dunning et al, 1988: p.120) but some sections of the working-class failed to conform.

Similar to ordered segmentation, the concept of incorporation has also received much criticism, Armstrong (1998) argues that "hooligans do not have values that differ markedly from the rest of society and that there is little hard evidence that they come from the most deprived and roughest working-class estates" (Cited in Bairner, 2006: p.586). Collins (2005) also supports Armstrong's argument as he dismisses "the belief that 'de-civilizing' behaviour necessarily comes from the working classes and other groups at the bottom of the social order" (p.301).

Transnationally, the Leicester School's application of incorporation to explain football-related violence is dismissed, as Roversi and Balestri claim in Italy, "the social basis of the ultras does not consist predominantly of the lower and roughest strata of society" (cited in Dunning et al, 2002: p.141). The Leicester School's application of incorporation therefore is "characterized by unconscious and conscious bias, in that many of the criteria used to distinguish the culture of the rough working class are drawn from wider culture and are formulated in terms of middle

class values" (Best, 2010: p.580). This reflects a broad agreement within the literature in opposition to the Leicester School's application of incorporation.

As well as a broad agreement within the literature opposing the Leicester School's application of incorporation, a common criticism of the Leicester School has been the methodological flaws which have discredited the validity and reliability of their research. The first research method used by the Leicester School was an "ethnographic approach in which one of the teams carried out a series of observations, participant observation and informal interviewing" (Best, 2010: p.583). Although this method theoretically could have provided an in-depth qualitative understanding of why football-related violence occurs, Best (2010) argues that the Leicester School failed to carry out the minimum requirements needed to give the findings the necessary validity and reliability. The Leicester School's failure to "give an account of the process of data collection and data analysis, and in particular how the inference was drawn from the observations made" (Best, 2010: p.583) has undermined the integrity of The Leicester School's research.

Best (2010) further argues that "the Leicester research is unclear in terms of its unit of analysis and the focus is on a sole researcher attempting to collect descriptions of behaviours and snippets of conversation that have an Eliasian feel to them" (p.583). The selective use of the data collected by a sole researcher severely hinders the applicability of the Leicester's School's findings. This selective use of the data would suggest that the Leicester School's findings are undermined by researcher bias as the findings appear to fit the larger narrative based on Elias's civilising process, similarities can be drawn between the Leicester School's speculative attempt to fit the ethnographic findings around the notion of the civilising process and the Marxist theories which also attempt to shape their theory around an over-arching narrative.

The Leicester School's methodological approach is a microcosm of the broader flaws and fallacies of the Leicester School's theory. Dunning and his colleagues have been heavily criticised for producing a theory which is largely anecdotal and speculative in its very nature which leads to the suggestion that "Dunning's approach tends towards teleology" (King, 2002: p.4). This is not only visible in the data gathering and analysis process; it is also visible in the conclusions that are drawn.

The Figurational approach provided by the Leicester School attempts to offer an alternative explanation of why football-related violence occurs to the early Marxist approaches. Through the concepts of ordered segmentation and incorporation, in an attempt to explain the aggressive character of the working-class, there is a clear neo-conservative undertone which cites the uncivilised nature of the working-class as the cause of football-related violence. However, this school of thought has faced fierce criticism both of the concepts and the methodology. Although the Leicester School's contribution to the development of studies of football-related violence should be respected and acknowledged, the aura of universalistic applicability and irrefutability (Wagg & Williams, 1991: p.177) surrounding their theory on football-related violence is problematic.

Mass Media Approach

A school of thought that contrasts greatly from The Leicester School and the other traditional class-based explanations of football-related violence is provided by Stuart Hall and his colleagues at the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, Birmingham.

Hall and colleagues focused on the relationship between football-related violence and the mass media. Since football-related violence "first began to attract public attention and concern- in the mid 1960's- it has received very extensive press coverage" (Hall, 1978: p.15). The dramatic nature of football-related violence led to it being covered extensively by the mass media in an attempt to boost sales and raise the viewership. However, Hall (1978) argues that despite the extensive coverage by the press, "only a very small proportion of the population has any direct experience of 'football hooliganism'" (p.15). This is a similarity that can be traced to other phenomena such as terrorism (Jackson et al, 2011). Therefore, it has led to a large proportion of the population indirectly experiencing football-related violence through media coverage.

The relationship between football-related violence and the mass media is integral, as Hall argues that the media performs a number of roles. As there is limited experience of football-related violence, "the media provide the principal source of information about this problem for the vast majority of the public" (Hall, 1978: p.15). This important role carried out by the press can either be as "the primary definers of a problem; or they can contribute to the public definition of a social problem" (Hall, 1978: p.16). Both methods used by the press to present football-related violence to the general public are significant as they shape the perception of the

problem.

The "public concern about football hooliganism is not, however, based exclusively on information or facts" (Hall, 1978: p.16), instead it is based on a number of impressions and explanations shaped by the mass media with differing agendas and motives. This subsequently has implications for how football-related violence is perceived. The mass media wield a large amount of responsibility with the expectation that they will provide impartial coverage of football-related violence in order to educate the vast majority of the population. However, this assumption does not take into account the motivations and interests of media outlets that are shaped by individual biases.

However, Hall (1978) argues that "there is a major problem about the way the press has selected, presented and defined football hooliganism over the years" (p.15). Rather than placing the phenomena within the adequate context needed to educate the general public about football-related violence, the argument is made that the mass media is in fact guilty of "exaggerating and sensationalising the character of the problem and for isolating the violent and sensational aspects from their proper social context" (Hall, 1978: p.20). To fully understand Hall's argument, it's important to define what sensationalisation is, Hall (1978) describes it as a process where "the most sensational stories come first, rank highest in the hierarchy of the news or to process and present stories so that the most sensational angle is headlined" (Hall, 1978: p.24).

Whilst the nature of football-related violence is sensational, the coverage the mass media gave to the phenomena inadvertently had "the effect of increasing the scale of the social problem it sets out to remedy and contain- largely by suppressing what the true nature of the problem is" (Hall, 1978: p.20). This effect is what Hall describes as the 'amplification spiral' as the amount of reports surrounding the deviancy of football-related violence increases, it inflates the importance and threatening nature of the phenomenon and leads to a "boosting (of) the very phenomenon which society and the press wants to control" (Hall, 1978: p.25). This initial boost of the phenomenon is a result of the media presence and media input in shaping the coverage of football-related violence which often leads to calls "for tough measures of control. This increased control creates a situation of confrontation, where more people than were originally involved in the deviant behaviour are drawn into it" (Hall, 1978: p.25).

As more people are enticed by a situation of confrontation, it leads to a spiralling effect where a deviant act such as football-related violence is amplified to a broader audience. Hall (1978) stresses that "the press has a significant part to play in each twist of the cycle. Press coverage can, inadvertently, help to produce the direct opposite of what is aimed at- more rather than less of the deviance it is trying to control" (Hall, 1978: p.25). Therefore, the heavy coverage of football-related violence by the mass media and specifically the increasing amount of calls for tough measures for control led to an environment susceptible for the amplification of deviant acts, one of which is football-related violence.

However, Hall's theory of the amplification spiral has been subject to criticism, Ramon Horak argues that Hall fails to mention cases of de-amplification in which the mass media can play a positive role in reducing the occurrence of football-related violence by diluting the amount of stories and the sensationalist rhetoric which accompanies stories related to football-related violence (Horak, 1991: p.545). This was visible in the coverage of the 2002 World Cup, although there were a number of media outlets suggesting that South Korea and Japan would be unable to cope with the threat of football-related violence, in reality, there were very little crowd behavioural issues.

The Mass Media approach provided by Hall presents an argument that the role of the mass media inadvertently leads to football-related violence's occurrence. Hall and his colleagues argue that the coverage of football-related violence glorified and amplified the phenomenon to a broader audience. However, there is a theoretical limitation to the media amplification theory, provided by Ramon Horak. Horak highlights instances of de-amplification and the role the media can play as a positive influence to reduce incidences of football-related violence, which Hall does not mention.

Ethnogenic Approach

Building on the theoretical groundwork of Harre and Secord (1972), Peter Marsh and his colleagues attempt to provide the Ethnogenic explanation for football-related violence. The Ethnogenic methodological approach was based on direct observations of football fan behaviour as well as accounts provided by fans themselves. Elements of both the Marxist and Media Amplification theory are visible in the Ethnogenic approach.

An analysis of football-related violence by England and
Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

Marsh and his colleagues applied the concept of 'aggro' to football fans in order to explain why football-related violence occurs. Marsh (1978b) describes aggro "as a means of referring to conflict and the resolution of conflict" (p.13). The use of 'aggro' in relation to conflict and the resolution of conflict when attempting to explain why football-related violence occurs is a similarity that can be seen between the Ethnogenic approach and the Subcultural Marxist approach. Marsh argues that aggro "expresses aggravation- in fact, this is the root off the term" (Marsh, 1978b: p.13). Marsh (1978b) further argues that "'aggro' is quite different from other patterns of violence and hostile expression" (p.29). This is where Marsh "draws the distinction between 'real' or 'proper' violence, and 'aggro' or 'ritual aggressive action'" (Dunning et al, 1988: p.19). Rather than physical violence, 'aggro' describes a "display of hostility, the issuing of threats and the conventions of challenge and counter-challenge" (Marsh, 1978b: p.14). This key distinction made by Marsh is the crux of his explanation of why football-related violence occurs and why the perception of the phenomenon is inaccurate.

Rather than 'real' or 'proper' violence, "Aggro isn't, nor has it ever been, just about fighting" (Marsh, 1978b: p.17). Instead, Marsh (1978b) claims that "an important element of aggro is bluff […] the aim is to achieve the end that a violent assault might but without resorting to violence" (p.17). Therefore, football-related violence through the guise of 'aggro' is a psychological tool used to defeat opposition fans and act as a resolution of conflict.

A significant aspect of 'aggro' is its ritualised nature as he describes it as "a highly distinctive, and often ceremonial, system for resolving conflict" (Marsh, 1978b: p.65). The ceremonial nature of aggro on the football terrace is the concept's most distinguishable feature as it "derives from consensus on a set of rules" (Dunning et al, 1988: p.19). These rules bear great responsibility as they "establish when an attack is appropriate, rules that govern the course and objectives of the fight, and rules that govern its termination" (Dunning et al., 1988: p.19) which prevents the violence from escalating in severity.

The highly systematic and structured nature of the football terraces suggests that "soccer terraces all over the country, [...] (were) miniature social worlds (that) exist and flourish. It is these social worlds which constitute a micro-culture within our society" (Marsh, 1978a: p.63). The significance of a micro-culture is that it implies that there is form of order and hierarchy to each individual micro-culture. Marsh describes order as "shared meanings, and social roles and a system of rules" (Marsh, 1978a: p.63). It undermines the media narrative that football-related

violence and the perpetrators of the social phenomenon are 'senseless'. This is where a similarity can be drawn between the Media Amplification theory and Marsh's own explanation as he argues that the media narrative which advocates harsher penal measures- is a trend which has a very serious side-effect (Marsh, 1978a).

"As external controls are stepped up, internal controls begin to lose their effectiveness" (Marsh, 1978a: p.78), this loss of internal controls leads to "'distortions' of the 'normal' course of 'aggro'" (Dunning et al, 1988: p.20). This external intervention leads to a breakdown of "the delicate consensus on which the ritual, and hence 'orderly', character of 'aggro' is dependent" (Dunning et al, 1988: p.20). Therefore, 'aggro' acts as a mechanism to prevent incidents of physical harm from occurring, something that ties into wider debates about politically motivated violence and how ideology can limit aggression (Lewis & McDaid, 2017, p. 648).

As one of the most controversial perspectives provided to explain why football-related violence occurs, Marsh and his colleagues have faced fierce criticism both from academics and more broadly from the mass media. The school of thought received both methodological critiques and much broader critiques which questioned the reasoning of Marsh et al.

In relation to 'aggro', Dunning et al. criticise the ethnological approach, arguing that "it is wrong to conceptualize 'ritual violence' and 'real' violence as mutually exclusive alternatives" (Dunning et al, 1988: p.21). Whereas Konrad's critique of the ethnological approach is historically based as he argues that "sport probably originated from highly ritualized, but still serious hostile fighting" (Konrad, 1966: p.271) which undermines Marsh's claim that football-related violence's severity is overstated. The failure of Marsh and his colleagues could be as a result of neglecting "the systematic study of situations and forms of hooligan behaviour that are most likely to be at variance with the ritual aggression hypothesis e.g. missile throwing" (Dunning et al, 1988: p.21). The example of missile throwing reveals the limited nature of Marsh's explanation of why football-related violence occurs and what impact it has.

In methodological terms, the ethnological approach has received a number of critiques. The research method of direct observation of football matches has been criticised due to a lack of context to explain the situation that Marsh and his colleagues were describing. The selective use of camera footage which "focused on a segment of the day's events, when, as a result of segregation, penning and police control" (Dunning et al, 1988: p.22) enables Marsh et al. to

support the argument that football-related violence's severity is overstated rather than providing "comparably systematic observations of pre-match and post-match encounters" (Dunning et al, 1988: p.22). Therefore, the reliability of the ethnological methodological approach is undermined by researcher bias.

The ethnological approach attempts to provide a direct explanation of why football-related violence occurs through observations and accounts by fans which leads to the key concept of 'aggro', the psychological trait which encompasses ritualised violence as a means of resolving conflict. Marsh specifies that ritualised violence differs greatly from 'proper' violence as the concept of 'aggro' provides a set of rules which restores order on the football terraces through an internal consensus which football fans abide, Marsh argues external intervention such as law enforcement disrupts the delicate balance which 'aggro' provides.

Although Marsh's theory provides an explanation of why football-related violence occurs which surpasses the methodological flaws of other schools of thought for lacking the necessary fieldwork, Marsh's explanation has received equal amounts of criticism particularly methodologically for the selective use of video footage. This limits the applicability of these findings significantly.

Securitisation

So far, this review has focused on schools of thoughts that have provided an explanation of why football-related violence occurs. However, there is also the question of the responses to the violence. One of the most prominent schools of thought in discussions of how such threats are framed and dealt with relevant to this study is securitisation.

"As a perspective that is philosophical and in a very flexible sense sociological, securitization is above all political'" (Williams, 2015: p.114). In its broadest terms, "Securitization can [...] be seen as a more extreme version of politicization" (Buzan et al, 1997: p.23) as "'security' is the move that takes politics beyond the established rules of the game and frames the issue either as a special kind of politics or as above politics" (Buzan et al, 1997: p.23). As security is defined "in terms of exception, emergency and a decision (although not by a singular will, but among people in a political situation)" (Waever, 2011: p.478), securitisation theory is clearly influenced by Carl Schmitt as security is viewed as an extension of "the specific political distinction to which

An analysis of football-related violence by England and Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

political actions and motives can be reduced (to) that between friend and enemy" (Schmitt, 2007: p.26).

Similarities can be drawn between the securitisation theory provided by the Copenhagen school and the Schmittian view of the political as a distinction is made between the regular practices of party politics and the exceptional instances which goes beyond the realms of normal political practice.

Significantly, it is this perspective shared by the Copenhagen school and Schmitt which means that an issue is "presented as an existential threat, requiring emergency measures and justifying actions outside the normal bounds of political procedure)" (Buzan et al, 1997: p.23-24). Therefore, "by labeling it as security, an agent claims a need for and a right to treat it by extraordinary means" (Buzan et al, 1997: p.26). However, in the case of Euro 2016, football-related violence isn't presented as the existential threat, which sees it overlooked in favour of terrorism.

Instead, as an extension of textual analysis carried out by Waever, securitisation is the instance when a particular "issue is (deemed to be) more important than other issues and should take absolute priority" (Buzan et al, 1997: p.24). Furthermore, "the exact definition and criteria of securitization is constituted by the intersubjective establishment of an existential threat with a saliency sufficient to have substantial political effects" (Buzan et al, 1997: p.25). This can also be seen in the empirical material as the threat of terrorism in France is the issue that takes the absolute priority as an existential threat with a saliency sufficient to have substantial political effects which effect the tournament.

For the process of securitisation to be successful, "the existential threat has to be argued and just gain enough resonance for a platform to be made from which it is possible to legitimise emergency measures that would not have been possible had the discourse not taken the form of existential threats" (Buzan et al, 1997: p.25). Therefore, the media portrayal of the political elites is crucial to the understanding of securitisation during Euro 2016.

Securitisation, therefore, "is what in language theory is called a speech act. It is not interesting as a sign referring to something more real; it is the utterance itself that is the act" (Buzan et al, 1997: p.26). This means that "a discourse that takes the form of presenting something as an

existential threat to a referent object does not by itself create securitization—this is a securitizing move" (Buzan et al, 1997: p.25). A number of securitising moves can be seen within the empirical material as "securitizing moves are engraved in social mechanisms" (Balzacq, 2015: p.106). One of these social mechanisms is the influence and role of the media which combined with the media amplification theme makes securitisation, a crucial area of discussion for the Analysis Chapter.

Analysis and Conclusions

This literature review has explored the theoretical perspectives of football-related violence by examining schools of thought which explain why football-related violence occurs. As well as drawing a number of similarities and differences between the schools of thought, themes can be drawn to express the explanation of each school of thought. The explanatory themes and the themes specific to Euro 2016 will be used as units of analysis in the Analysis chapter.

The early Marxist perspectives explained that football-related violence was the working-class resistance to the post-war changes to the sport and similarly, the Subcultural perspective cited the encroachment of the bourgeoisie and the relative freedom of the working-class youth from the tacit control of the parent class as the explanations for football-related violence's occurrence. This can be summarised as the theme of alienation.

The Figurational perspective provided by the Leicester School centres around the theme of isolation. The Leicester School argues that a stratum of the lower working-class is isolated, disconnected from the civilising tendencies of the rest of society. The Leicester School condemns and belittles the 'rough working-class' for their behaviour which supports a broader neo-conservative ideology. This example of the Figurational perspective shaping their research around a broader over-arching ideology is also visible in the early Marxist perspectives. Although the theme of isolation and alienation could be useful units of analysis, it is difficult to conceptualise the motives of those involved in football-related violence.

Alternatively, a theme that is visible primarily in the Ethnogenic school of thought is 'aggro'. The Ethnogenic perspective argues that the concept of 'aggro' plays a large role in the explanation of football-related violence. Ritualised aggression is regarded as a means of self-control amongst football fans. Traits of this theme are identified in the media sources with the theme of

aggro being a useful unit of analysis.

The Mass Media school of thought built its explanation of football-related violence around the themes of 'sensationalisation' and 'amplification'. Hall and his colleagues argue that the mass media exaggerates the scale of the problem which leads to the sensationalisation and inadvertently, the glorification of the problem of football-related violence. This can be seen through the rhetoric used and the angle that the media takes to present the problem. The sensationalisation of football-related violence often leads to the amplification of the problem. As the mass media influences the opinion of the broader audience who have limited direct experiences of the social phenomenon, it leads to an escalation of the problem. As this research project is carrying out media content analysis by examining newspaper articles that provide coverage of football-related violence at Euro 2016, the theme of sensationalisation and amplification will be important units of analysis.

In addition to these themes derived from the traditional academic perspectives, the theme of securitisation has also been identified. Securitisation provides the primary theoretical explanation for the response to football-related violence at Euro 2016. It is, therefore, this theme intertwined with the themes of sensationalisation and amplification that will be used as units of analysis for media content analysis.

As well as identifying themes, a similarity that can be drawn between the established schools of thought is the methodological limitations of the studies. The Early Marxist approaches and Figurational approach have all been accused of being speculative as they lack the hard evidence needed to prove their hypotheses. The Ethnogenic approach has also been accused of manipulating their findings to support their hypothesis. Another criticism that has been pointed in the direction of the established schools of thought is the Anglocentric nature of their research which is heavily reliant on the peculiarities of the heavily structured British social class system. This severely hinders the generalisability of the established school position to a transnational social phenomenon. In direct contrast, the Mass Media school of thought can be utilised in different culture settings and contexts which makes it the most applicable theory to use in the Analysis chapter. This research project acknowledges and understands the methodological limitations of the academic schools of thought, this will have an impact on the methodological choices made within the Methodology chapter.

Overall, this literature review has examined the theoretical debates and perspectives surrounding football-related violence. Having explored the critical debate framed around the phenomenon, this literature review has provided the foundation of knowledge needed to make the correct methodological choices in the Methodology chapter, it has also provided the platform for the Analysis chapter as the theoretical understanding developed in this chapter will be used to examine and analyse the sources. Due to the prominent and contemporary nature of the issue of football-related violence at Euro 2016, there is a clear gap in the literature for analysis which bridges the gap between the relevant established theoretical positions and the contemporary event of the European Championship.

Methodology Chapter

Qualitative Approach

As this research project explores football-related violence as a social phenomenon, a qualitative approach that goes beyond the surface of statistical analysis is the most suitable approach to use. The qualitative approach allows the "research design/strategy (to) be fluid and evolutionary" (Matthews & Ross, 2010: p.142). This fluid evolutionary structure particularly benefits the method of analysis that has been chosen as the units of analysis have evolved and changed over the course of the research process.

The differences identified between the qualitative and quantitative approach, further justifies the decision to carry out a qualitative research project. Punch (2005) argues "Quantitative research is empirical research where the data are in the form of numbers" (p.3). This research project explores the relationship between the media and football-related violence and the responses to incidents, which cannot be explained by empirical evidence presented in numerical form. The aims of this research project are therefore "to achieve 'depth' rather than 'breadth'" (Blaxter et al, 2010: p.65) which justifies the choice to opt for a qualitative approach.

The qualitative approach has a number of advantages. One of the advantages of using the qualitative approach is that it "can help to understand apparently illogical behaviours" (Barbour, 2014: p.15). In the case of this research project, it will enhance the understanding of football-related violence which is perceived to be illogical behaviour.

Rather than relying on positivist principles such as the unity of the scientific method and the belief that scientific knowledge is testable which can only be proved by empirical means, this research project is reliant on "the principles from interpretive and critical social science" (Neuman, 2011: p.167). These principles best suit the aims and objectives of the research project and further supports the choices made for the research method and method of analysis.

However, the qualitative approach has been criticised for a number of reasons. "The archetypal criticism of qualitative methods is that the data collection is largely anecdotal or exaggerated" (Pierce, 2008: p.46). Similarly, Bryman (2014) argues that qualitative methods are often guilty of being "impressionistic and subjective" (p.398). Therefore, this research project will be careful

when carrying out the data collection process to avoid any instances of exaggeration or impressionism.

Another criticism of the qualitative approach is that "the method is also 'soft'; it lacks the intellectual […] rigour of the quantitative method" (Pierce, 2008: p.46). Therefore, this research project will incorporate the intellectual rigour of the literature review in the Analysis chapter by referring to some of the themes identified in the Literature Review chapter.

Despite the issues raised, the qualitative approach is pivotal for this research project as it provides a platform for the aims and objectives to "be answered by describing and explaining events through analysis of the understandings, beliefs and experiences" (Matthews & Ross, 2010: p.142) which the research method of choice will enable.

<u>Process-Tracing</u>

Within the broader qualitative framework, this project will be using a form of process-tracing as the primary research method to chronologically examine the events that transpired at the European Championship in 2016.

The process-tracing method can be described as an attempt to identify the intervening causal process between an independent variable (or variables) and the outcome of the dependent variable. (George & Bennett, 2005).

One of the main advantages of process-tracing is that it provides a means of contributing to theory development and theory testing which goes beyond the capabilities of statistical analysis (George & Bennett, 2005). Therefore, process-tracing is the most suitable qualitative research method to answer the aims and the objectives of this project.

More generally, process-tracing provides an alternative method to make causal inferences which aren't possible through the constrained framework of controlled comparison (George & Bennett, 2005). In the instance of this project, causal inferences are made about the media coverage of incidents of football-related violence between England and Russian fans, this cannot be done through the method of controlled comparison.

An analysis of football-related violence by England and Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

Another advantage of process-tracing is that it is useful for obtaining an explanation for deviant cases (George & Bennett, 2005). As this project is focusing on a very contemporary issue, media coverage of football-related violence at the 2016 European Championship, this arguably falls into the category of a deviant case.

For this project, the process-tracing method will take the form of a detailed narrative, this form will allow an explanation of how the event (of football-related violence at the European Championship) came about (George & Bennett, 2005). This method will support the broader aims of this project by providing a platform for an explanation of why football-related violence occurred at Euro 2016.

Furthermore, process-tracing is a tool that generates numerous observations within a case and it is the way that these observations are linked which explains the significance and occurrence of the case (George & Bennett, 2005). This function of process-tracing is visible within the main conclusions of this research project as the observations and links between them are explored and stated there.

The examination of media sources between the months of May and July 2016 will provide the basis of the core material for the Analysis chapter. Therefore, the process-tracing method that this project will be applying is a linear approach (George & Bennett, 2005). Taking this linear approach, the Analysis chapter will examine the media coverage: prior to the tournament; of the incidences of football-related violence and in the aftermath of these incidences.

Media Content Analysis

To augment the process-tracing element of the work, the method of source analysis that this project will use is media content analysis. One of the earliest descriptions of this technique is provided by Berelson (1952) who describes content analysis as "a research technique for the objective, systematic and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication" (p.19). However, this research project will not analyse football-related violence through a quantitative perspective.

Instead, this research project will carry out thematic content analysis rather than enumerative content analysis. Thematic content analysis "adds depth of explanation as to why and how

words have been used in particular ways and what the major discourses are" (Grbich, 2007: p.112) which supports the qualitative aims of this research project. Therefore, the emphasis will be placed on "the trends and patterns of words used, their frequency, their relationships and the structure and discourses of communication" (Grbich, 2007: p.112). This enables a transformation of the data during the data analysis process to turn from description to interpretation (Barroso & Sandelowski, 2003: p.908).

One way of doing this is by determining "the extent of bias" (Pierce, 2008: p.264) which this research project will do by assessing each of the media sources related to football-related violence at the European Championship. Through the ProQuest database, articles of liberal, centrist and conservative news organs will be carefully selected to provide a balance between the extremities of the political spectrum.

There are two main considerations related to media content analysis to take into account, one of which is the definition of analytical categories. Hsieh & Shannon (2005) argue a potential issue is "failing to develop a complete understanding of the context, thus failing to identify key categories" (p.1280). Taking this into consideration, this research project will provide the necessary context in the introductory stages of the Analysis chapter before further defining the themes that were drawn from the literature review.

An implication of the choices made is that this research project will make "thematical distinctions between the units of analysis" (Krippendorff, 2013: p.108). Some of these themes have been carefully drawn from the academic literature.

A common issue which media content analysis faces is that it "often requires study or research involving foreign languages, and thus poses problems of translation" (Roberts, 1972: p.25). Therefore, this research project will avoid this issue by focusing solely on media sources written in the English language in the period of time between May and July of 2016, as aforementioned, it was between these months that the European Championship took place and the vast majority of the media coverage of the tournament was undertaken.

To bypass any potential ethical issues or any problems accessing the media sources (Harrison, 2001: p.117), this research project will be accessing media sources in the public domain. The use of secondary data will place "considerable distance between the researcher and the

subjects in question" (Pierce, 2008: p.264). Therefore, this research project will comply and work within the framework of the University of Huddersfield Code of Practice for Research.

The other major consideration that this research project acknowledges is the Manifest-Latency issue (Holsti, 1969: p.12). Some academic circles argue that content analysis "must be limited to manifest content (the surface meaning of the text) […] (rather than) the deeper layers of meanings embedded in the document" (Holsti, 1969: p.12). The manifest content of the text does not include "any social or contextual factors outside of, or subsequent to, the text itself" (Richardson, 2007: p.17). However, as this research project is proceeding with a qualitative form of content analysis, this research project will look to go beyond the surface meaning of the text and provide a deeper understanding of the messages and meanings of the media sources.

Content analysis has, however, been heavily criticised by fellow academics as it is "considered [...] to be a simplistic technique" (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008: p.108). One of which is Sumner (1979) who claims that content analysis "lacks a theory of meaning" (cited in Hansen: 1998: p.91). This research project will circumnavigate the issue of simplicity by applying the complexity of peer reviewed academic theory to the media sources through thematic units of analysis. The bridge between the classical academic theory and the contemporary events described within the media sources provides a suitable theory of meaning.

However, "much of the criticism which has been directed at content analysis touches on problems more to do with the potential and actual (mis)-uses and abuses of the method, than to do with any inherent weaknesses of this method" (Hansen, 1998: p.98). This suggests that a carefully considered methodical approach would not compromise the integrity and the validity of the analysis and the conclusions drawn from the findings. The use of this method of analysis, best fits the qualitative nature of this research project. It also allows a deeper explanation of football-related violence by providing the theoretical context as well as enabling the bridging of the gap between the academic theory and the contemporary events through the process-tracing method.

Source Selection

As aforementioned, this research project will use the Proquest database to search for primary sources which, to comply with ethical guidelines, are readily available in the public domain. The

result of this search was the collation of thirty-eight newspaper articles. However, only twenty-seven of those articles made up the core material for the Analysis Chapter.

There were three major criteria for the inclusion and subsequent exclusion of sources. The first was the usage of national newspapers rather than regional newspapers which had a specific localised focus. Also, as part of this selection process of national rather than regional newspapers, there was a conscious attempt to balance the political bias between the liberal and conservative perspectives, on the issue of football-related violence.

The balance was found by selecting articles primarily from the Daily Mail, Daily Express and The Telegraph which are widely recognised as conservative news outlets and The Guardian, The Independent and the Daily Mirror which are equally recognised as liberal news outlets (Temple, 2008).

Due to the global focus on the issue, a major criterion for inclusion was that the newspaper articles must be written in the English language, this led to the exclusion of a number of articles written by newspapers across central Europe which weren't written in the English language.

The final criterion for inclusion was that the majority of media sources had to be written and published within the specific timeframe of the months between May and July 2016, as it was between these months that the European Championships took place. The only exception being articles that addressed the preliminary planning and preparations put in place prior to the tournament taking place.

These criteria led to the exclusion of a number of articles. Due to the narrow localised focus, regional articles from the Plymouth Herald, Yorkshire Post, Southern Daily Echo and the Coventry Telegraph were excluded. The other major newspapers which were excluded from analysis were The Sun and The Daily Star, neither newspaper provided an incisive perspective which contributed towards an understanding of why football-related violence occurred at the European Championship.

Data Coding and Theme Generation

Coinciding with source selection, the data analysis process led to the development of key themes for the Analysis chapter. Through emergent thematic coding, each individual source was placed in a corresponding category. Subsequently, three key discussions emerged: the Securitisation discussion; the policing discussion and the sensationalisation and amplification discussion. There was further thematic coding, specifically within the sensationalisation and amplification discussion, as distinctions were made between the political and sporting body approaches of the two states.

As part of the data coding process, the key words of 'football-related violence' and 'football hooliganism', were searched for, in relation to Euro 2016, specifically the events in Marseille and the involvement of Russian and English fans, as their involvement was most widely reported by news organs, across the political spectrum.

The result of this keyword search saw across an array of articles, a commonality shared. The commonality was reflected in the rhetoric used which was one of securitisation. This led to securitisation emerging as a prominent factor in the coverage of football-related violence and a subsequent search of the keywords 'security' and 'security operation' in relation to the European Championship further supported the reflection that the narratives were framed through a securitised framework.

Coinciding with this theme, due to the security-orientated coverage, a frequent topic of discussion within the sources was policing. Further keyword searches of 'policing' in relation to Euro 2016 highlighted how it was a major issue for concern due to the frequent coverage of policing at the tournament, this led to its emergence as a key theme within the Analysis Chapter.

Therefore, the theme generation for the Analysis chapter was a combination of the themes of Media Amplification and Sensationalisation which derived from the Literature Review and also the themes of Securitisation and Policing which emerged during the data coding and collation process.

An analysis of football-related violence by England and
Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

There are, however, two major limitations to the source selection and theme generation process. The first major limitation is the issue of language. As one of the criterions for inclusion is that the sources must be written in the English language, the exemption of articles from across Europe which are written in other languages could potentially limit all available perspectives on the topic, it also hinders the generalisability of some of the findings.

The second major limitation is the nature of the themes. With the focus on securitisation, policing, media amplification and sensationalisation, the focus of this study primarily reflects the elite perspective on the issue of football-related violence. Therefore, there is less scope for grassroot narratives which provide an alternative perspective and explanation for why football-related violence occurs.

Conclusion

Overall, the decisions made regarding the methodology are based on what would be most suitable to achieve this project's aims and objectives. A qualitative approach is most applicable for this project as it will enable in-depth analysis of football-related violence within a singular setting. As this project is attempting to explain why football-related violence occurred and the responses to it, process-tracing is the research method that provides the most suitable framework for the Analysis chapter. The use of media content analysis of secondary data available in the public domain ensures that this project remains within the ethical guidelines. Coinciding with process-tracing and media content analysis, the source selection and data coding process provided the necessary material and themes for the Analysis Chapter. The methodological choices are the most appropriate choice to provide the best opportunity to analyse the coverage of football-related violence at the 2016 European Championship in the Analysis chapter and more broadly, throughout this research project.

An analysis of football-related violence by England and
Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

Analysis Chapter

This chapter chronologically examines the media coverage of Euro 2016 by exploring three key discussions surrounding the incidences of football-related violence at the tournament. The most notable incident of football-related violence was the clashes between Russian and English fans in the city of Marseille. As well as the clashes themselves, this chapter also focuses on the media coverage prior to the tournament and also the media coverage in the aftermath of the incidences of violence.

The first discussion explores the relationship between the theme of securitisation and the media. Through the media portrayal of the attitudes and mind-sets of the political elites in the preparatory stages of the tournament planning, it is apparent that, these attitudes are characterised by a securitised response to potential violence at the tournament. This discussion also examines the media's support of the securitised response which leads to the dramatisation of perceived threats, it is the media's ideological convergence in support of the securitised response which inadvertently contributes towards lapses in security as it led to a collective oversight on the issue of football-related violence.

The second discussion explores the media reporting of the French policing approach. This section of the chapter examines in detail, the media coverage of the incidents that took place in Marseille on the 11th June 2016, specifically at the Stade Velodrome following England's 1-1 draw with Russia. Based on media content analysis of British newspaper reporting of both liberal and conservative persuasion, whilst there was a convergence between the media and the security services in support of a securitised response, this support diminished when the media began cross-examining the French authorities' response to that and other skirmishes within the city. The condemnation of the French police's robust reaction raised awareness to the perceived injustices being made against football fans which inadvertently amplified the deviant act by uniting football fans in opposition to the French police.

The final discussion explores the themes of sensationalisation and media amplification and more broadly, the influence of the media on framing the perception and discussion of football-related violence at elite level and for the general public. Instances of sensationalisation and media amplification are traced throughout both the policing debate and more broadly, the coverage of Euro 2016. This leads to a media paradox being explored where it can be seen that

An analysis of football-related violence by England and Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

the policy establishment supports the media amplification of the threat of terrorism but condemns the media scrutiny of the police response to this threat, this then leads to the policy establishment and the media feeding off each other but at the same time also opposing one another. Finally, there is an exploration of the media portrayals of the British and Russian responses to the incidences of football-related violence which reveals how elites attempt to use the media to their own advantage.

Overall, this chapter argues that the Euro 2016 coverage was a demonstration of the influence the media holds to frame the perception and discussion of football-related violence at elite level, as well as for the general public. In the instance of this tournament, this is done through the amplification of the phenomenon, the ways in which amplification occurs are explored in greater detail below.

Attitudes and Mindsets- the Securitisation discussion

When France won the bid to host the 2016 European Championship (Euro 2016) in 2010 by just a single vote, almost immediately plans began to be made to ensure the tournament would be a success. However, the six-year period between winning the bid and the tournament itself has been a turbulent period for France. In the post 9/11 climate, certain precautions had to be put in place for any major sporting event and Euro 2016 was no different as a heavy emphasis was placed on international security through the guise of securitisation (King & Sharp, 2006: p.383).

As mentioned in the Literature Review chapter, securitisation in this project is understood to be "the intersubjective establishment of an existential threat with a saliency sufficient to have substantial political effects" (Waever, 2004: p.9). The perceived existential threat is established through the language and rhetoric used by political elites and media outlets.

The form of securitisation that this project refers to is the Copenhagen school approach which concentrates "on the middle levels of securitisation in which egotistical collective political actors (often but not always states) mainly construct their securitisations against (or in the case of security communities with) each other" (Buzan & Waever, 2009: p.254). Due to a multitude of threats faced by France, primarily Islamic-inspired terrorism which saw incidents such as the Charlie Hebdo murders and the massacre at the Bataclan theatre, these incidents and the

An analysis of football-related violence by England and
Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

emphasis on securitisation was further amplified by the global attention on the continental tournament.

However, this project argues that the reporting of Euro 2016 demonstrates that the securitised response taken in preparation for this continental tournament was problematic due to its focus on terrorism at the expense of other issues. Whilst the terrorist threat justifiably received attention from both the political elites and the media, this change in focus inadvertently contributed towards lapses in security as other issues to public safety, including football-related violence, were overlooked with serious consequences for fan safety.

During the preparatory stages of the tournament, amongst a wide array of media sources from differing ideological perspectives, the securitised rhetoric was visible in the reporting and coverage of a potential terror threat at Euro 2016. A number of conservative leaning media outlets framed their narrative through a securitised framework. This can be seen in the articles from *The Express* by Tom Batchelor and also from *The Telegraph* by Laura Hughes. Whilst this is perhaps to be expected of the conservative press, a number of liberal leaning media outlets also framed their narrative through a securitised framework. This is visible in the article from *The Guardian* by Jamie Jackson and also a *Time* magazine feature by Vivienne Walt. The ideological convergence amongst media outlets in favour of a securitised response led to the coverage of the preliminary stages of the European Championship being dominated by a heavily securitised rhetoric. This will be explored in greater detail below.

The preliminary stage and the Securitised response

Building up to Euro 2016, one of the biggest threats to both French national security and the continental tournament was terrorism. Following the Paris attacks in 2015, Jackson's article provided some insight into the perception of the mind-set and attitudes of the French Football Federation and the competition organisers:

> Noël Le Graët, (the French Football Federation president) [...] said security is now a higher concern for next summer's France 2016 European Championship. There was already a concern for the Euros, now it's obviously a lot higher. We will continue to do everything we can so that security is assured despite all the risks that this entails […] but it's a permanent concern for the federation and the [French] state (Jackson, 2015).

The above passage demonstrates that from the earliest stages of the tournament, the theme of securitisation was underpinning media coverage of the European Championship, as Jackson framed the preparations being made "in terms of security" (Waever, 2004). As concerns were raised about the risk of terrorism, there was added vigilance as at the time of his article, the French terror threat level was at the maximal level. Whilst the concerns surrounding the threat of terrorism were justified, other potential threats to public safety were overlooked, which undermined the security operations put in place.

The media's portrayal of a pre-tournament meeting between the French Football Federation and Uefa by Jackson revealed that "a 'philosophically' derived view of securitization that defines it as emergency […] and as the antithesis of normal politics" (Williams, 2015: p.118) was guiding the response to potential threats at Euro 2016. This securitised response was supported by a broader Schmittian view of security (Waever, 2011: p.478). The Schmittian view of security is the belief that political actions and motives can be reduced to that of friend and enemy.

Within Jackson's article, one of the integral members of the meeting mentioned is:

> Jacques Lambert, the chairman of Euro 2016 SAS, a joint venture between the French federation and Uefa", (Lambert defines the roles and responsibilities of Uefa within the preparatory stages of the competition, the administrative body is heavily involved in the decision-making process as they) […] "make the decisions so that the Euro finals can be held in the best security conditions. Security in stadiums works well, the risk is more in the streets, in spontaneous gatherings. (Jackson, 2015).

This passage shows that there had been some discussion about the differing levels of threats between potential hostilities in city centres and potential hostilities at football stadia. However, due to the primary focus on the threat of terrorism, there is little evidence in the reports that the potential impact of football-related violence and alcohol-related crowd disorder received the necessary attention.

Justifying the Securitised response- the Media dramatisation of a potential terrorist threat

Terrorism in particular, was continuously highlighted by the media prior to the tournament. The organisers expressed confidence that "security would be a key component in the tournament's success" (Jackson, 2015). The symbolic meaning of this phraseology is significant, as it attempts to signify a show of strength and act as a means of giving reassurances to potential

spectators of the tournament. This emphasis on security was fuelled by the media portrayal of the terror threat.

The threat of terrorism dominated media coverage of the Euro 2016 preparations, highlighting the dangers of potential attacks. The news reports which documented these potential attacks were a clear example of the dramatisation of a perceived existential threat (Patomäki, 2015).

As part of the pre-tournament media coverage, a *Time* magazine article written by Vivienne Walt addressed the potential for terrorist attacks. Similarly, despite having a differing ideological stance, articles from *The Express* by Tom Batchelor and *The Telegraph* by Laura Hughes also highlighted this threat by documenting some of the foiled attacks which were reportedly planned to occur during the continental tournament. In the build-up of the preliminary stages of the tournament, the news broke that:

> A French citizen (had been) arrested with a "vast arsenal" of explosives and assault rifles (who) was planning '15 attacks' to coincide with the tournament. News of the plot came as French intelligence said it was 'deeply concerned' about a potential attack from home-grown terrorists (Hughes, 2016).

This came in the aftermath of the attacks in the Belgian capital, Brussels, in March 2016. The fear and anxiety in the media, and its portrayal of the terrorist threat, surrounding Euro 2016 can be seen both in Walt's article and Batchelor's article despite the authors writing from differing ideological perspectives.

The fear and anxiety were reflected in the media portrayal of the French build-up to the tournament:

> In recent weeks, the talk on French television over a potential attack during Euro 2016 has almost overwhelmed the pre-match discussion about the teams' chances. The stakes are extremely high, both practically and symbolically. If the championship concludes on July 10 without incident, French officials might finally be able to turn the page on the traumatic events of 2015 (the Paris attacks and the Charlie Hebdo attacks) (Walt, 2016)

The above passage provides a deeper insight into the context surrounding the tournament, Walt insinuates that the well-being of the tournament had much broader implications symbolically. It also showed that unlike previous tournaments, the rhetoric of the media was not celebratory.

An analysis of football-related violence by England and Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

Instead, the influence of the media was used to frame the terror threat in a way which justified the security-driven pre-tournament coverage.

Furthermore, the French media, who focused primarily on security during the pre-tournament coverage of the European Championship, were an example of how the media had the influential role of shaping the discussion (Hall, 1978: p.15) and framing the terror threat for the vast majority of the public.

Significantly, the mass media had a large responsibility of shaping the public perception of the threat of terrorism as only a small amount of the population have directly experienced terrorism (Jackson et al, 2011). Within the media sources, there were examples of the media shaping the public perception of terrorism:

> After the Brussels attacks in March, the French paper Liberation reported that the jihadists had planned to mount an attack on the soccer tournament, and had only targeted the Brussels Airport and Metro train as a desperate alternative as police closed in on their hideout in the Belgian capital (Walt, 2016).

The passage above is a prominent example of the media shaping the public perception of terrorism, the months building up to the tournament was dominated by the terrorist attack in Brussels and the potential implications that it could have for Euro 2016. It was this discovery and reporting of the foiled plot which enabled the media to dramatise the threat of terrorism further to justify a securitised response.

Furthermore, despite a difference in ideological stance, Batchelor's article also provided an example of how the media can shape the public perception of terrorism by dramatising the threat:

> According to reports, the jihadi cell en route to Europe is heavily armed and ready to split into two, possibly to carry out simultaneous attacks in both Belgium and France, which have been rocked by recent ISIS-linked terror attacks […] No specific targets were cited in France, although the country is hosting the Euro 2016 championships in 10 stadiums across the country until July 10, with around 2.5 million spectators expected to watch the 51 matches (Batchelor, 2016).

Similar to Walt, the above passage shows that Batchelor supports the claim that there is a clear threat of terrorism. However, whereas Walt is willing to explicitly state that Euro 2016 is a target

of terrorism, there is a clear tone of doubt and scepticism about the likelihood of an attack at the European Championship.

However, the insinuation made by Batchelor that Euro 2016 is a target of terrorism is a prominent example of the media shaping the perception of the threat of terrorism by dramatising it. Therefore, both Walt and Batchelor present Islamic-inspired terrorism as an existential threat and dramatise the issue, as a means of supporting the securitised response.

Although the media coverage prior to the tournament focused solely on the threat of Islamist terrorism, significantly, the potential perpetrator of this attack which was so heavily covered by the media was aligned with far-right extremism. Therefore, this showed that the securitised response is heavily rhetorical as "counterterrorism is equally rhetorical in that a primary concern for officials [...] is how the public perceives their actions" (Zulaika, 2009: p.29).

Rather than focusing on numerous threats, the focus for policy makers in the run up to Euro 2016 was countering (Islamist) terrorism. Whilst it was justified in one sense, it also appears to be an attempt to look favourable to the public as the policy makers are seen to be attempting to address a salient global issue. However, the fact that this foiled attack was not the threat they expected reveals the problematic nature of the securitised response that was supported and advocated across various sections of the print and online newspaper media.

The potential threat of a terrorist attack at the European Championship and the securitised response had further implications in a geopolitical setting as the tournament was framed within the terms of security by media outlets across continental Europe. In Britain, a *Telegraph* article written by Laura Hughes in the build up to the tournament argued the threat of terrorism at the European Championship was a very real threat which coincided with the dramatised coverage of the European Championship by other media outlets.

Hughes' article addressed the British state response to the threat of terrorism through a foreign office statement. The foreign office statement that Hughes refers to highlights the dangers and potential risks for spectators attending the tournament as "stadiums, fan zones, venues broadcasting the tournament and transport hubs and links represent potential targets for terrorist attacks" (Hughes, 2016). This passage reveals that the prioritisation of a terrorist threat as part of a securitised response transcends geopolitical bounds as the British authorities share

the securitised response undertaken by the French authorities.

As well as prioritising security, precautions have had to be put in place which wouldn't have been necessary for continental tournaments in the past such as the Foreign Office had to update "the travel advice to provide further information for fans on the risk of terrorism in France as they start to travel for Euro 2016" (Hughes, 2016). This is further evidence of the British political elites understandably prioritising the threat of terrorism as the British political elite were ideologically aligned with the French political elite in supporting the securitised response.

The warning that the Foreign Office issued stated that:

> There is a high threat from terrorism. Due to ongoing threats to France by Islamist terrorist groups, and recent French military intervention against Daesh (formerly referred to as ISIL), the French government has warned the public to be especially vigilant and has reinforced its security measures (Hughes, 2016).

This passage of the statement highlighted by Hughes is another example of the media amplifying the terrorist threat to support the securitised response. The examples of the dramatisation of terrorism stated above inadvertently contributed towards lapses in security as it led to a collective oversight of the potential to properly manage football-related violence.

Distinct cultural differences- the Policing discussion

Whilst the theme of securitisation and its limits is a prominent re-occurring theme in the reporting and coverage of football-related violence at the European Championship, the coverage of the incidents and the security service response to them revealed another overlapping theme: cultural differences.

The major cultural difference was the behaviour and approach of the French police, in comparison to that of the British and Portuguese police forces, this became a focal point for media attention as part of a critical cross-examination. In response to the violence, the media response was two-fold. Initially, there was overt criticism of the French police's behaviour, this was followed by a cross-examination of the French policing approach with approaches that were perceived to be successes. The two examples the media pointed to were the British approach and the Portuguese approach that was undertaken for Euro 2004 which was regarded as a

direct example of a policing strategy for a European Championship which is heralded as a resounding success (Pearson, 2016).

A number of media outlets, both conservative and liberal, address the behaviour of the French police. Providing a conservative perspective, articles from *The Express* by Jonathan Owen and also Fraser Moore, Katie Mansfield and Selina Sykes address and critique the French police's behaviour. Also, an article from Fraser Moore and Vickiie Oliphant for *The Express* tackles this issue. As well as *The Express,* Geoff Pearson's article for *The Times* and an article from *The Economist* offer the conservative perspective on the behaviour of the French police and the cultural differences between French and British policing.

Providing the liberal perspective, Ian Herbert's articles for *The Independent,* Matthew Weaver and Daniel Boffey's articles for *The Guardian* also explore the behaviour of the French police and the broader implications that it has had. As well as there being an ideological convergence amongst liberal and conservative news outlets in support of securitisation, there is also an ideological convergence about the limitations of the French police approach which is encapsulated by the French riot police (Compagnies Républicaines de Sécurité, CRS).

The French police and the securitised response

The problematic nature of the securitised response can be seen by the action undertaken on the ground by the French police. As the focus of the securitised approach remained on the threat of terrorism, the heavy-handed police tactics which were deployed to address a terrorist threat led to an escalation rather than a de-escalation of violence when applied to other threats including football-related violence.

Therefore, this approach acted in accordance with the securitised response promoted by the French political elites as the emphasis was placed on counter-terrorism. It was the problematic nature of the securitised response with a primary focus on terrorism which led to football-related violence falling into the background as a lesser issue (Buzan & Waever, 2009). This further supports the argument that the media-supported securitised response indirectly contributed towards lapses in security as the French police missed the obvious threat of football-related violence.

However, the limitations of the French police and the tournament organisers were further highlighted by Owen's account of the security arrangements:

> British police reinforcements could be sent to France in an attempt to crackdown on football hooligans. […] There have been serious security lapses since the start of Euro 2016, despite the 90,000 police, soldiers, and security workers deployed across France to counter the threat of terrorist attacks as well as football hooliganism (Owen, 2016).

Although, the numbers suggest that the security for the tournament would be sufficient, this reporting suggested that the lack of a coherent strategy to deal with a plethora of potential threats and the suggestion that outside intervention was needed undermined the heavy rhetoric of the securitised response.

These lapses of security were particularly visible in the reporting of the violence at the Stade Velodrome and the surrounding area:

> The sporting body has already launched disciplinary proceedings against Russia after England fans were attacked by Balaclava-clad thugs in the aftermath of last night's draw between the two countries at Marseille's Stade Velodrome. French police, normally notorious for their no-nonsense approach to football hooligans, were conspicuous by their absence in the stadium, where England fans were forced to clamber over barriers to escape (Owen, 2016).

The passage above shows that the zero-tolerance response by the French police was shared by the media as the rhetoric used by Owen to describe perpetrators of football-related violence as 'balaclava-clad thugs' was reflective of this zero-tolerance stance. Whereas, the approach taken by the French police escalated the violence within the city setting, it was the absence of the authority in and around the stadium which exacerbated the problem.

Within the Stade Velodrome, security in the stadium was described "as 'very poor' with stewards left to cope on their own for up to 10 minutes before help arrived" (Owen, 2016). Significantly, the lack of a coherent relationship between stewards and the police was a crucial oversight by the French police and the tournament organisers.

This lack of a coherent relationship between stewards and the police was highlighted when the cross-examination began and comparisons began to be made between the French policing strategy and the Portuguese policing strategy, within the media coverage. The relationship

between the police and stewards was highlighted as one of techniques utilised by the Portuguese authorities during the 2004 European Championship. This was part of "an evolving strategy used (to combat football-related violence) at the 2004 European Championship in Portugal (which) was a great success" (Pearson, 2016).

Although a similar approach was taken as there was a low presence of uniformed police officers within the stadia, "the (Portuguese) co-ordination with the stewards had to be extremely precise (with) police response squads […] placed strategically" (Council of Europe, 2005: p.18). Similarly, "the British 'policing' style of uniformed officers and stewards on duty in the ground is planned, reactive and assertive" (Frosdick & Marsh, 2005: p.164).

The media reports continued to use the Portuguese and British football policing strategies as benchmarks to cross-examine the French strategy which was distinctly different as it lacked the organisation and communication between the police and the stadium staff. In Owen's portrayal of the French approach, therefore, we can discern a critique of an incoherent strategy to deal with non-terror related threats within the stadium setting.

One of the strategies implemented before the start of the tournament was the issuing of Football Banning Orders (FBOs) which prevented known troublemakers from travelling to the tournament. In Britain, there were 3,200 FBOs in place for the 2010 World Cup in South Africa.

Ahead of the tournament last summer, the amount of FBOs for British citizens had fallen to 1,832 due to a number of the travel bans expiring (Armstrong, 2016). Despite, the sharp fall in FBOs, there was a false sense of security about the issue of football-related violence and the impact it would have at the continental tournament.

Pearson highlights how Football Banning Orders have played a major role in the success of previous continental tournaments:

> Football Banning Orders on 'complaint' (rather than following conviction) were brought in two years later after more disorder at the European Championship in Belgium in 2000. There followed 15 years of relative calm, both domestically and abroad, with high-risk tournaments in Portugal in 2004 and Germany in 2006 passing off successfully. Banning orders, it was claimed, had played a pivotal role in stopping hooliganism abroad. (Pearson, 2016)

The above passage highlights that there was a perceived notion that football-related violence had diminished due to the preventative banning orders. This led to a misplaced trust in the effectiveness of banning orders which ultimately undermined the French security response when football-related violence did arise.

This misplaced trust in the effectiveness of FBOs is debunked by Pearson who argues:

> There were two problems with this claim. First, disorder abroad hadn't gone away. Incidents in Munich 2001, Slovakia 2002, Albufeira 2004, Cologne 2006, and involving Manchester United fans in Rome in 2007 and Everton in Lille 2014, among many other incidents, should have indicated that there was still an issue. Second, the disorder in Marseilles and Brussels was not caused by known troublemakers. This was brushed under the carpet (Pearson, 2016)

The passage above refers to six incidents which were where England fans, either internationally or domestically, were arrested after acts of football-related violence. This continuation of football-related violence abroad showed that FBOs were only effective when part of a broader strategy to tackle the issue of football-related violence. This passage also highlighted the influence of the media as Pearson argues that the media did not reveal that the disorder was not caused by known troublemakers.

Even though the perceived effectiveness of FBOs had diminished, it was not an unusual strategy to be deployed, FBOs had played a part in the success of the Portuguese policing approach. However, the more general approach taken by the Portuguese authorities differed significantly from that undertaken by the French authorities as:

> It became known as the "friendly but firm" approach whereby small numbers of officers mingled with fans in an attempt to set tolerance limits and manage minor incidents (Pearson, 2016).

The passage above is significant as Pearson acknowledges the success of the Portuguese approach and attributes the friendly but firm approach undertaken as the more effective policing stance to address football-related violence and deal with alcohol-related disorder.

It was this flexible friendly but firm policing approach of the Portuguese police as part of a broader strategy of inclusivity which prevented any minor crowd disturbances from escalating out of control (Council of Europe, 2005: p.14). Considering this approach was taken just three

months after the Madrid bombing, this was a demonstration of an effective policing strategy to combat any potential threat at a major continental tournament in a high-pressure situation.

In comparison to the Portuguese approach, the French approach, as reported, appeared to be a problematic method of tackling the problem. From the earliest stages of the tournament, whilst the French police's focus remained solely on terrorism, it was clear that instances of football-related violence and anti-social behaviour would be met with the same response.

The French approach, therefore, implemented the securitised response through a zero-tolerance attitude which led to the misapplication of a counter-terrorist response to deal with standard crowd issues.

One of the main reasons why the zero-tolerance policing approach was undertaken is the dominant political discourse on public order within France was heavily securitised. This directly contrasts with the media portrayals of the approaches taken in other contexts in past tournaments:

> If you look at how football matches are policed in the UK and Germany and in Sweden, in all these areas the police interact with the fans before incidents occur. They are then able to identify potential troublemakers (Weaver, 2016).

The above passages show how several European states were travelling in one direction to deal with threats to public safety, whereas the French approach was heading in the other direction. Rather than acting in a proactive fashion like in Germany, Sweden and the UK, the French response was primarily robust and reactionary.

This approach undertaken by the French authorities was underpinned by "a powerful law-and-order coalition (which) often constructs negative images of civil unrest and conveys public messages that stress how it grossly debilitates society" (Atak & della Porta, 2016: p.613). The influence of the dominant political discourse and law-and-order coalition often lead to calls for harsher penal measures (Atak & della Porta, 2016: p.613).

This broadly supports the academic approach of Marsh (1978a) who also argues that harsher penal measures are promoted by the media and the political establishment in response to

An analysis of football-related violence by England and
Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

football-related violence.

Whilst securitisation and adversary dominated the media coverage and the approach taken by the French authorities, the French police did partake in international co-ordination in their attempt to combat football-related violence when it did begin to occur.

Although the dominant political discourse within France was heavily securitised, the political discourse of the EU was one of co-operation. Within the European Union, the Council of Europe advocated "greater co-operation between the police of the countries involved. They cite the example of the World Cup in the USA in 1994 as a tournament that was not marked by violence but by strong co-operation between police and fans" (Rowland, 2001).

Therefore, amongst the broader European elite, it was believed that the close co-operation between the police forces of different localities was integral to combatting football-related violence. This was visible in European Union law which favoured "strengthening international police cooperation in order to counter violence in stadiums more effectively" (European Parliament, 1996).

As well as having European political elite support, theoretically it was argued that "the host country should make maximum use of the support that foreign police forces can supply and foreign police support should form part of the host organisation's tactical plan" (Adang & Cuvelier, 2001: p.27). This was clearly visible in the preparations for Euro 2004 as the Portuguese authorities placed a great emphasis on international co-operation amongst police forces of different localities as part of a broader tactical plan.

Furthermore, as well as accessing information and intelligence from differing national police forces, the Portuguese authorities trained the differing national police forces and allowed them to be integrated into the intelligence structures (Council of Europe, 2005: p.25).

In direct comparison, whilst the French police authorities did co-operate with differing national police forces, it was reportedly done reluctantly as there were instances of "intelligence officers from the English police […] advising their French counterparts and (they) simply haven't been listened to" (Weaver, 2016). This reluctant facilitation of cooperation amongst police forces of different localities, encapsulated the cultural differences visible between the British and French

policing approach.

When incidents of football-related violence and anti-social behaviour began to flare up primarily involving England fans ahead of their group stage fixture against Russia, some distinctions were made within the media about England fans behaviour as it was described not as "organising fighting but drink-fuelled disorder." (Herbert, 2016a)

The distinction that Herbert makes about the England fans is significant as it distances England fans from organised violence which is often associated with football-related violence. Rather than organised violence, the behaviour in Marseille was described as:

> (England fans who) brought the worst instances of English excess drinking and anti-social behaviour to southern France, (British) officers desperately want to prevent the actions of a minority spiralling out of control by provoking an increasingly strong French reaction. There has been a substantial element of provocation behind the violence in Marseille's old port, some English conduct has been an embarrassment and shown the absence of any kind of self-policing among groups (Herbert, 2016c).

The passage above presents the argument that there is a lack of self-policing among the groups, this supports the broader academic argument provided by Marsh (1978b) that football-related violence is managed and minimised by aggro. This was also a working demonstration of the cultural differences between the French and British policing approach, as the passage above insinuates that the British officers were attempting to prevent a strong French reaction.

There were further examples of this conflict between the British and French police approach within the media reporting. The media reporting of this conflict contributed towards the cross-examination as comparisons continued to be drawn and suggested that the French police disproportionately addressed instances of crowd disorder, whilst senior British officers did not believe they were "dealing with large, high-risk groups of individuals intent on causing violence. They are actually mediating with drunks" (Herbert, 2016d). The task of dealing with alcohol related behaviour rather than football violence meant that:

> British police officers played a vital role in preventing (the) situation from escalating – (as they persuaded) the French to let them use diplomacy and negotiating skills to reason with English drunks as the situation escalated. French riot police told senior British officers that water cannons would be deployed if they could not deal with the unruly English, including one group who had been unhappy when a bar stopped serving alcohol

earlier than anticipated. The British negotiators – or 'spotters' – managed to de-escalate that situation (Herbert, 2016d).

This passage highlights both the co-operation and cultural differences between the French and British police. Herbert presents the argument that the adversarial French policing approach was problematic as the French response would have led to an escalation of violence without the British intervention.

Furthermore, the reporting of "British police 'spotters' (who were) attempting to help cultural understanding on the ground and limit confrontations" (Herbert, 2016d) was an additional demonstration of international co-operation within the media coverage as well as the cultural differences coming to the fore as the British police adopted to use the firm but friendly approach which included diplomacy and negotiation whereas the French police's approach was security-driven and heavily adversarial.

Whilst police co-operation is quintessential to effective policing of football-related violence, it is not an effective tool on its own. It has to be part of a broader strategy with a tolerant mindset, neither of which were visible in the French police approach due to the nature of the securitised response.

The adverse effects of the problematic French police approach

Due to the securitised approach taken by the French police, where the challenge facing the tournament was framed as a counter-terrorist one, by both the policy establishment and the media, it led to a robust decisive zero-tolerance response being taken. This became a complicated factor when the threat of terrorism was not the only challenge.

In its place a more well-rounded view of policing continental tournaments should have been undertaken. Instead, the adverse effects of the zero-tolerance approach became visible when incidents of anti-social behaviour began to flare up. Media reports of the disturbances make this very point.

When incidents of anti-social behaviour and alcohol-related disorder began to arise, the response carried out by the CRS was met by a media response which was heavily critical:

An analysis of football-related violence by England and Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

At 6pm on Friday, England fans who had been drinking peacefully were confronted by CRS officers with shields in a tortoise formation. It was like a red rag to a bull. Half a dozen England fans threw bottles at them. The police responded with tear gas affecting innocent fans and locals, some of whom threw bottles back. It was a classic example of how the reactionary "show of force" can escalate crowd disorder (Pearson, 2016).

In this passage, Pearson highlights the limited capacity of the robust French police response as this was an example of "the police, and the actions of police officers, (acting) as a significant contributory factor in the escalation of activity towards disorder" (see also King and Waddington 2006, Body-Gendrot 2013, Fassin 2013) (Newburn et al, 2016: p.2). The heightened tension and hostilities caused by this reactionary show of force were an example of the misapplication of robust counter-terrorism measures to deal with the lesser threat of football-related violence.

This passage also provided a demonstration of a high-profile approach taken by the French police as "officers were more often dressed in riot gear and accompanied by their riot vehicles […] which made it less easy to approach them" (Adang & Cuvelier, 2001: p.68). This high-profile approach undertaken had adverse effects as it inadvertently led to an escalation of the violence when applied to issues of alcohol-fuelled disorder and football-related violence.

This high-profile policing stance taken as part of a zero-tolerance approach was underpinned by a confrontational attitude. An adverse effect of the zero-tolerance approach taken by the French police was the inadvertent activation of boundaries (Tilly, 2004) which stimulated "the formation of collective identities and their mobilization" (Atak & della Porta, 2016: p.612) of football fans in collective opposition to the French police. However, it was the media's cross-examination of the French police approach in reference with the friendly but firm approaches which amplified the phenomenon by raising awareness of the perceived injustices that football fans faced which inadvertently contributing towards football fans' collective opposition to the French police.

Whilst friendly but firm policing that de-emphasises in group-out group differentiation can be effective in preventing incidents of collective aggression (Adang & Cuvelier, 2001), there was a clear phenomenological approach undertaken by the French police. This approach regarded football fans simply as the other who needed to be controlled using a zero-tolerance approach.

The formation of collective identities amongst football fans was, therefore, in opposition to the French police which was driven by a shared sense of injustice, this reveals the theme of

An analysis of football-related violence by England and Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

alienation.

Whilst the Marxist interpretation of alienation is primarily in response to the changing nature of football (Taylor, 1971a), in this case, reports suggest the alienation and injustice felt was against indiscriminate zero-tolerance policing.

In response to the adversarial approach by the French police, football fans used "chairs from nearby cafes and glass bottles as weapons" (The Economist, 2016). Although it is reported that the "French police (were) desperately trying to break up brawls with riot shields as they try to prevent the incident from escalating" (Moore & Oliphant, 2016), in fact it was the adverse effects of the robust counter-terrorism approach undertaken by the police which led to further violence.

This zero-tolerance approach was utilised to address incidents of anti-social behaviour when:

> a gang of local youths approached 250 England fans drinking outside an Irish bar and started goading them. Two bottles and a chair were thrown. The police responded by firing tear gas and baton rounds into the crowd. Almost all of those affected by the gas and rubber bullets had done nothing wrong at the time, but violence escalated (Pearson, 2016).

This above passage is significant as it is another example of the reports' emphasis on the French zero-tolerance approach's limited capacity to deal with the perceived lesser threats. The indiscriminate use of tear gas was one of the prime examples of the misapplication of counter-terrorism measures in the wrong setting.

The limited capacity of the police highlighted by the media contributed towards an over-arching conflict between the police and aggrieved football fans which aligned other securitisation issues including the threat of terrorism beneath it (Buzan & Waever, 2009), despite the focus of the securitised response being primarily on terrorism rather than football-related violence.

In response to this behaviour by England fans and more broadly perpetrators of football-related violence at the European Championship, the attitude of the French police was heavily condemned. When crowd disorder involving football fans began to flare up in the city of Marseille, the response taken by the French police was condemned in the media:

> There is a nothing-or-all approach from the French police. They stand back, they don't

do anything until incidents develop and then they use overwhelming force. If they carry on like that there will be greater disorder in Marseille today. We are presumably going to see increased numbers of police whose job it is to break heads. If it is policed in the same way then I can only see a repeat but on an escalated scale (Weaver, 2016).

This passage highlights the counter-productive nature of the French approach where any incident of violence or disorder was met by overwhelming force. As well as Weaver, numerous other media publications criticised the French police as they were seen to be escalating "the problem through heavy-handed tactics" (Boffey, 2016). Rather than nullifying the threat and de-escalating the violence, there were fears that a continued uncompromising approach would lead to an escalation of violence on a greater scale.

Although what was portrayed as an uncompromising approach limited the police operation, the strategies implemented by the CRS combined with the intense media scrutiny and coverage of the French police response amplified the salience of football-related violence. Also, the strategies of the CRS were in accordance with the securitised response advocated by both the political elites and media outlets as an extension of the politics of the extraordinary (Williams, 2015: p.115).

Therefore, the zero-tolerance approach was underpinned by repressive and reactive heavy-handed tactics which were effective when dealing with the threat of terrorism. However, the approach when applied to lesser threats including football-related violence led to an escalation of violence. The indiscriminate use of tear gas and the disproportionate response to minor incidents by an adversarial police force, amplified by the media coverage of the response, also led to an escalation of the violence.

Rather than focusing on the amalgamation of techniques which had been developed across continental Europe to effectively combat football-related violence and mitigate the potential escalation of violence, the French policing approach was reflective of the securitised response and hindering cultural differences which led to the French police missing the obvious threat of football-related violence.

The problematic nature of the French police approach was heavily scrutinised and cross-examined by the media to the point where the French police and the broader French political elite accused the media of sensationalising the issue of football-related violence which amplified

An analysis of football-related violence by England and Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

the issue and escalated the violence further. However, it was the repressive and reactive heavy-handed tactics of the French police which was the main contributory factor towards the escalation of violence.

The Influence of the Media- the Sensationalisation and Amplification discussion

A theme which can be traced throughout both the policing debate and more broadly the coverage of Euro 2016 is the themes of sensationalisation and amplification. Building upon Stuart Hall's findings (1978), the purpose of this section is to determine how influential the media is at framing the discussion and perception of football-related violence and the response to it. This is predominantly done through the processes of sensationalisation and media amplification.

This section also explores the paradox where the policy establishment and the media feed off each other but at the same time act in an adversarial way when an incident occurs and is subject to scrutiny. The adversarial conflict between the policy establishment and the media sees both side use the media to portray their open condemnation of the actions of the other.

Also, the influence of the media to frame the discussion and perception of football-related violence is visible in the British and Russian response to the incidences of violence. Within this section, similarities and comparisons are drawn between the political and the sporting body approaches of the two states and also how the elites of these two states use the media to their advantage.

The influence of the media- Policing debate

In the aftermath of the incidences of football-related violence in the city of Marseille, the attention of the media turned to the French police's reaction. Articles from Jonathan Owen for *The Express;* Inti Landauro and Jonathan Robinson for the *Wall Street Journal* and an article by Myriam Rivet, Brian Love and Richard Lough for the international news agency *Reuters* all provided coverage of the French police reaction. These articles offered an insight into the French reaction and also offered examples of amplification and sensationalisation.

In response to the heavy media scrutiny of the French police response, there was a different

An analysis of football-related violence by England and Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

narrative portrayed within the media by the French police themselves:

> French police played down the events and insisted all measures necessary were taken to prevent upheaval and said they would work hard to stop more violence. Following the clashes in Marseille and to prevent further violence, French Interior Minister Bernard Cazeneuve said he ordered local authorities to ban the sale, consumption and transportation of alcohol in "sensitive" areas on the days potentially violent matches are played and on the days before (Landauro & Robinson, 2016).

The above passage inadvertently reveals the themes of sensationalisation and amplification as the French police insinuate that the media portrayal of the events in Marseille was overstated and the coverage of the events led to the deviant act of football-related violence being amplified to a broader audience (Hall, 1978). It was also a working example of the influence of the media as the French police used the media itself as a platform to portray this narrative.

Despite this different narrative, there was a contradiction between the statement that all necessary measures had been taken and the support of a problematic securitised response which primarily focused on the threat of terrorism and saw football-related violence fall into the background as a lesser issue.

This accusation of sensationalisation could be seen threaded throughout the French response which was supported by the French political elite and then portrayed by the media:

> The tournament kicks off with France still under a state of emergency after Islamist militants launched simultaneous assaults on entertainment venues in Paris in November, killing 130 people. Interior Ministry spokesman Pierre-Henri Brandet said Friday night's trouble amounted to a scuffle between fans that did not call security measures into question (Rivet et al, 2016).

This passage explains the context and the pressure that the French political elite were under to ensure safety at the tournament. Brandet's comment also reveal the complex role that the media undertakes.

Whilst the media feeds the policy establishment on the diet of a terror threat and the policy establishment welcomes the media's amplification of the threat of terrorism and respond to it accordingly, the policy establishment also condemns the media for sensationalising, through high-profile coverage (Hall, 1978), the response taken to address the incidents of football-related violence that unfolded.

An analysis of football-related violence by England and Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

Therefore, the comments made by the Interior Ministry insinuate that the media attention to the incidents at Euro 2016 was part of a general media over-reaction to the response taken to address the challenges the police faced at Euro 2016. It was this perceived over-reaction and the presentation of the incidents by the mass media (Hall, 1978) that led to the Interior Ministry's claim of sensationalisation.

Whilst there are examples of sensationalisation and amplification in the reporting of the securitisation and policing discussions, more broadly, instances of sensationalisation and amplification are visible within the reporting of the responses provided by the elites representing Britain and Russia. This can be categorised as two separate responses, the political and the sporting body response. The political response to the incidents was provided by politicians from both the U.K parliament and the State Duma.

From the British perspective, the media attention was limited from both the liberal and conservative perspective with only articles from Ian Herbert for *The Independent,* Daniel Taylor for *The Guardian* and Benedict Moore-Bridger for *The London Evening Standard* focusing solely on the British response to the incidents.

More overwhelmingly the British media focus was on the controversial Russian response. From the liberal perspective, Shaun Walker and Daniel Boffey presented *The Guardian* perspective as well as an editorial piece from *The Guardian.* There was also an article by Kim Sengupta for *The Independent* as well as articles from *The Week* and Jon Fisher for *Goal.com*.

In contrast, providing the conservative point-of-view, David Martin Jones and MLR Smith provide *The Telegraph* perspective. In addition to these articles, there was also a *Telegraph Sport* editorial piece, an article by the Russian news agency *TASS* and an article by Matthew Dunn for *The Express*. The other major contributor for the conservative perspective was the *Daily Mail* with articles from Matt Barlow, Will Stewart and Matt Slater. These articles contributed to the discussion about the responses.

Immediately after the incidents in Marseille and the neighbouring cities, the focus of the media turned to the political responses of Britain and Russia. The British political response was swift and to the point as it was clear from the very beginning that football-related violence was not to

be tolerated in any format under any circumstances.

This zero-tolerance attitude was reported extensively in the media by the leading British government voice in response to the violence who was:

> Damian Collins, a member of the Commons Culture, Media and Sport Select Committee, said the violence between English and Russian fans in France was a throwback to the 'worst excesses' of the Eighties […] Collins said stripping Russia of the 2018 tournament would be the "ultimate threat" from Fifa and that world football's governing body had to challenge officials about the arrangements for the Finals in two years' time. (Moore-Bridger, 2016).

The above passage shows how the media portrayed the British political response to football-related violence as one of zero tolerance. However, whilst the violence was condemned, ultimately the blame was apportioned towards Russian fans and the Russian state.

In direct comparison, the Russian political response was provided by Igor Lebedev, the deputy chairman of the State Duma, who held a much more extreme view. Lebedev caused controversy when his initial comments on social media overtly supported the violence. The comments were reported extensively by numerous news outlets in the UK as a demonstration of the cultural differences between Russia and Britain:

> 'I don't see anything wrong with the fans fighting' Igor Lebedev wrote on Twitter. 'Quite the opposite, well done lads, keep it up!'. […] Lebedev (continued) 'I don't understand those politicians and officials who are criticising our fans. We should defend them and then we can sort it out when they come home' Lebedev wrote in a series of tweets (Walker, 2016a).

The media portrayal of Lebedev's response to the incidents of violence as far more extreme and controversial was compared directly to the zero-tolerance stance of the British political elite, which amplified the shock factor of Lebedev's response. It was also a demonstration of the cultural differences between the two states as Britain and Russia were on different ends of the spectrum when it came to dealing with football-related violence.

This viewpoint held by Lebedev could also be traced throughout the Russian media response. Despite the severity of the potential repercussions from Uefa, the broader response from the Russian media attracted attention from Western media outlets:

> The next day, European football's governing body expressed 'utter disgust' at the

An analysis of football-related violence by England and
Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

clashes in the centre of Marseille and "serious concern" over what had happened in the stadium. Uefa says it will consider banning the Russian or English team if there is more trouble. The response in the Russian media (was) a mixture of incomprehension and contrition, combined with a large dose of self-justification and a pinch of what could be mistaken for national pride (The Week, 2016).

The above passage shows how Western media outlets portrayed the Russian media response as an extension of the broader Russian political response. Therefore, there was a distinct collective political response to the violence by Russia which was portrayed by the media as follows:

Lebedev's comments were extreme but reflected a general mood of defiance in Russia over the violence. There has been a whisper of condemnation but it has been drowned out by very loud complaints that the apportioning of blame is unfair, with England fans mainly responsible, as well as not a little amount of gloating over the fact that Russia fans supposedly 'won' the clashes. (Walker, 2016b)

This passage shows that the media reported the main narrative, that was carefully threaded throughout both the Russian political response and by extension the response of the Russian media, which was a message of defiance and apportioning of blame to the Western media and Britain itself. This combination of a message of defiance and apportioning of blame is the main similarity between the British and Russian political response.

Similarly, Igor Lebedev who continued to be one of the most vocal opponents to the criticism that Russia was receiving also used the media to apportion the blame:

He added that it was unfair that Russian fans were being targeted for criticism when it was England fans who had begun the violence, and also noted that there had been violence involving other fans at the tournament, including ahead of the match between Poland and Northern Ireland (Walker, 2016a).

Lebedev's comments insinuate that the Western media outlets' motives and agendas (Hall, 1978) led to the sensationalisation of the incidents by specifically targeting Russian fans for criticism. However, whilst it is true that Russian fans did receive a lot of attention from media outlets across Europe, it was the severity of the violence which led to such coverage.

This led to a "back and forth" exchange as Damian Collins also used the media as a platform to

apportion the blame away from England fans. In response to Lebedev's comments, Collins focus turned to Russia:

> I think what's also been really worrying is the response from people in Russia to the behaviour of their fans. When you get people like Igor Lebedev — not only deputy chairman of the Russian parliament but also on the executive of the Russian football association — basically defending the action of the fans and more or less telling them to keep it up, you question 'do people in Russia take this as seriously as they should?' (Moore-Bridger, 2016).

The reporting of this incident here allows us to see similarities between the British and Russian political response, as Collins attempts to deflect responsibility away from Britain and apportion the blame to Russia. The main evidence that Collins presents to the media to condemn the Russian authorities for their sluggish response to the violence is the reluctance of Russia to provide French authorities with the necessary information to apprehend the perpetrators of the violence. This accusation was, therefore, in response to the perceived Russian overt support of the violence and defence of the perpetrators, both from political officials and the Russian media.

As well as the reporting of the response provided by the political elites of Britain and Russia, there was also a response provided by the sporting bodies of both states, picked up on by the media. For England, it was provided by representatives of the Football Association (FA). For Russia, it was provided by representatives of the Russian Football Union (RFU). There was also a response from the then manager of both national teams. Amongst these responses, sensationalisation and amplification are re-occurring themes.

As part of a response to these incidents, a statement was released to the press by Greg Dyke, the then chairman of the FA who from the very outset was one of the leading voices of the British response:

> They were 'abhorrent scenes' according to Dyke, welcoming the alcohol ban that has now been imposed on the tournament's host cities. However, Dyke takes exception to Uefa's account of what happened at the end of the 1-1 draw and makes it clear the FA partly hold the organisers responsible for not recognising the potential for disorder (Taylor, 2016).

Even though Dyke described the scenes as abhorrent, he also used the media as a platform to voice his critique of the tournament organisers. This can be traced through his remarks as he highlighted the lack of effective pre-emptive measures and advocated for an alcohol ban to be imposed on the tournament's host cities.

An analysis of football-related violence by England and
Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

Although pre-emptive measures including an alcohol ban would alleviate incidents which were sparked by alcohol, Dyke's comments, similar to those of Damian Collins, used the media platform to apportion the blame elsewhere and revert the media attention to Russia:

> We join you in condemning the horrible scenes in Marseille way from the stadium on Thursday, Friday and match-day. A minority of English fans were clearly involved in some of those incidents and that is extremely disappointing to us all, but please also recognise that tens of thousands have behaved in a positive way (Taylor, 2016).

The passage above and the media sources more broadly allow us to see how elites attempted to use the media to their advantage by apportioning blame to their opponents. Dyke's remarks above regarding the incidents in Marseille are a prominent example of this. Whilst Dyke's measured response condemns the violence, there is a careful ascription of responsibility. As well as an ascription of responsibility, Dyke's inadvertent demand for the media to recognise the well-behaved football fans also reveals the themes of sensationalisation and amplification (Hall, 1978).

Dyke disputes how the press has selected and presented the incidences of football-related violence (Hall, 1978) as he argues the claims made by some media outlets that the problem of English football-related violence had returned to prominence was sensationalised.

From Dyke's response, it is clear that one of the key players within the English Football establishment recognises that the media can shape the discussion and perception of football-related violence and those involved through the processes of sensationalisation and amplification. As Dyke is actively trying to fight this, it is a demonstration of how salient the themes of media amplification and sensationalisation were in this setting.

As the British media coverage of the incidents portray England fans wholly as perpetrators of football-related violence, Dyke also disputes this claim and insinuates that the media response is unbalanced as there is an isolation of the violent and sensational aspects from their proper social context in the presentation of the incidents of football-related violence (Hall, 1978).

Whilst it is true that the media coverage of football-related violence broadly is dramatised due to the dramatic nature of the phenomenon itself, Dyke's attempt to apportion the blame away from the Football Association and England generally undermines the substance of his argument.

In direct comparison, the response from the Russian Football Union was less condemnatory and more supportive of the violence. The most vocal spokesman for the RFU was Vitaly Mutko. Although more controversial opinions received much of the media's attention and scrutiny, the Chairman of the Russian Football Union was portrayed by the media as the more moderate voice in response to these incidents of football-related violence:

> He (Mutko) initially downplayed the clashes, saying the media had exaggerated them, but later admitted it was right for Uefa to bring disciplinary proceedings against Russia and condemned the clashes. 'It's clear that some people didn't come here to watch football. They've covered their faces and then brought shame on their country,' he said (Walker, 2016b).

The passage above shows that whilst Mutko did eventually turn to a conciliatory stance, Mutko like Dyke attempted to use the media to apportion the blame away from his own fans as he claimed that it was exaggeration by Western media outlets.

Mutko's argument that the Western media outlets sensationalised the clashes was, therefore, a working example of the media amplification spiral (Hall, 1978). Mutko argued the sensationalised over-analysis of the clashes by Western media outlets which received global attention led to an amplification of the problem to portray Russia in a negative light.

The passage above is also a demonstration of elites using the media to their advantage as he is perpetuating the belief that Western media outlets were attempting to undermine Russia's credibility to host the 2018 World Cup. However, Mutko did eventually change his tone to one of condemnation as he criticised the Russian perpetrators of football-related violence. This showed that there was some substance to the media portrayal of the clashes in Marseille even if it was presented in a dramatic format.

Similarly, in response to intense media scrutiny, the FA response was to downplay the claims that football-related violence had returned as a wide-spread problem:

> Geoff Pearson observed in The Times that 'England fans have form in Marseilles'. Zoe Williams in The Guardian thought English officialdom had 'infantilised' football crowds. […] Less originally, the FA considered that 'while the vast majority of England fans

behaved impeccably', a small but 'aggressive hardcore' engaged in violence and 'score settling' (Jones & Smith, 2016).

Significantly, this passage shows the difference in perception of England fans between the sporting body, the political establishment and the media. This highlights that cutting through the media coverage of the incidents and the aftermath that ensued is a subtle nuance between the head of football associations and political figures. Whereas the football associations are more inclined to sympathise with the supporters, the reaction from political figures was more condemnatory and adversarial.

Furthermore, this carefully worded response revealed a similarity between the FA response and that of the RFU as the FA categorically disputed some of the media claims that portrayed the vast majority of England fans as perpetrators in these clashes in Marseille.

Like Mutko, the FA hinted that there was a broader media narrative which sensationalised the portrayal of the clashes. This occurred due to the condemnation of football fans at the tournament in general rather than just those who were involved in the violence. Due to the general public's limited experience of football-related violence, it was this broader media narrative condemning the social problem which inadvertently increased the scale of the issue through amplification (Hall, 1978).

However, although the media portrayal of the clashes was framed in a sensationalist manner and the broader condemnation of football fans was clear to see, the reporting of the police by the media was severely critical which suggested that the tactics undertaken by the French authorities increased rather than decreased the violence.

With a similar line to the FA, Roy Hodgson, the then England manager, issued a diplomatic statement to the press in response to the violence:

> As the England manager I am obviously now very concerned about the threat that is hanging over us and the sanction that could possibly be imposed upon the England team, I'm appealing therefore to all of our fans, and we appreciated your support at the matches of course, but I'm appealing to you to stay out of trouble to try and make certain these threats that are being issued are never carried out (Taylor, 2016).

This carefully worded statement was portrayed in the media in the same light as the broader Football Association line which condemned the violence, but it differed significantly from the British political response as it was clear that Hodgson didn't want to risk alienating the core support. Therefore, based on the reports, the measured response of the Football Association was closer to the correct analysis of the incidents and the response that was necessary to de-escalate the violence, despite the allegiance shown by the FA towards the fans.

Whilst the threat of possible expulsion from the tournament underpinned Roy Hodgson's response to the incident, the response from Russia's then head coach Leonid Slutsky was adversarial and combative.

Compared to the carefully written response by Roy Hodgson, Slutsky's response was portrayed as:

> There was not a great deal of contrition on display from the Russian camp […] it was a message of defiance mixed with veiled allegations of hypocrisy from manager Leonid Slutsky and striker Artem Dzyuba ahead of today's Group B fixture with Slovakia (Barlow, 2016).

Whereas Hodgson had used the media platform to attempt to stabilise the situation, the response from within the Russian footballing camp which was led by Leonid Slutsky and Artem Dzyuba was reflective of the Russian political response. The use of the media by members of the Russian national football team attempted to downplay the incidences of football-related violence and accused Western media outlets of sensationalising the issue by promoting stories and angles within stories (Hall, 1978) which reflected Russia in a bad light.

This message of defiance was personified by the reported remarks of Russia's striker Artem Dzyuba who was questioned about a potential politically motivated agenda:

> He suggested the level of criticism of Russian fans in the British media formed part of a political conspiracy, adding: 'We can see things that British media are talking about 2018 and people saying they must take it [the World Cup] out of Russia. I have these thoughts that must come up sometimes (Herbert, 2016e).

The media portrayed these comments as an insight into the Russian mindset, as Dzyuba suggested that footballing authorities in England and more broadly the British media establishment was attempting to use the media to their advantage to strip Russia of the World

Cup and more broadly to portray and push an anti-Russian agenda.

Like Lebedev, Dzyuba questioned the British media response as he stated that he didn't "understand the reaction of the British media, who have the impression that English supporters are like angels who came to this country and are just behaving themselves" (Barlow, 2016). As well as stating that the British media was using its influence to portray Russia in a negative light, there was also the suggestion that the British media sensationalised the behaviour of the Russian fans. As the mass media were the primary definers of the social problem (Hall, 1978), the suggestion was made that the focus was solely on Russian fans which in turn, neglected the English supporters' involvement.

However, the British media response like the British political response was intolerant of football-related violence by either side. As the mixed message of defiance and denial from both Slutsky and Dzyuba remained, parallels could be drawn between the duo and Sports minister Vitaly Mutko and more broadly, the Russian media.

The conspiratorial Russian perspective that was perpetuated by Dzyuba to the media was shared by Aleksandr Shprigin, the head of the Russian football fans' union who argued that the media response was to justify the position that "they have to take it (the World Cup) away from Russia" (Dunn, 2016).

Significantly, there is a crossover between the sporting body and the political establishment as this attitude has been visible in the Russian political establishment for a number of years. In 2015, Vitaly Mutko (who also holds the role as the Sport Minister in the State Duma) when questioned about the West and the possibility of Russia being stripped of the 2018 World Cup argued "attempts to slam Russia are a popular trend and a way to demonstrate one's toughness" (TASS, 2015) before categorically stating that the 2018 World Cup wouldn't be taken away from Russia.

From Dzyuba to Shprigin and Mutko, there is a clear conspiratorial point-of-view which argues that the mainstream media and more broadly the West has attempted to use the processes of sensationalisation and media amplification as part of a united anti-Russian agenda. There is the suggestion that this is done through a variety of methods including: defining the social problem, over-analysis of the clashes under the global microscope, and promoting stories which reflected

Russia in a bad light. However, this conspiratorial point-of-view was inadvertently a demonstration of the Russian political establishment using the media to their advantage.

Therefore, intertwined with the policing debate is a broader discussion about the themes of sensationalisation and media amplification in relation to the issue of football-related violence. Having established that the media supported a securitised response by fueling the threat of terrorism, this led to a paradox where the policy establishment supported the media amplification of the threat of terrorism but condemned the media scrutiny of the police response to this threat– when it was (mis)applied to football-related violence. This paradox saw the policy establishment and the media feed off each other but at the same time also oppose one another.

Whilst this was a broad demonstration of how political elites attempt to use the media to their advantage, through the examination of the reporting of the events, it can be seen that both the political establishment and the sporting bodies of England and Russia also attempted to use the media to their advantage. Also, both the British and Russian political establishment attempted to apportion blame and deflect responsibility away from their own fans by making claims that the media sensationalised and amplified the phenomenon, this was also visible within the response of the sporting bodies of both states. However, whilst there were some similarities, there was also a major cultural difference between the two states. The major difference was the nature of the response, whereas the British response was an expression of zero-tolerance, the Russian response was a message of defiance which was underpinned by a conspiratorial mindset which argued that Western media outlets push an anti-Russian bias.

Conclusions

Through a combination of process-tracing and media content analysis, this chapter has chronologically examined the media coverage of football-related violence at the European Championship by addressing three key discussions.

The first discussion explored the linkage between the theme of securitisation and the media. Whilst it was made apparent that a security-driven approach would be taken by the tournament organisers and the policy establishment, it was the media coverage in the preliminary stages of the tournament preparation that supported and fuelled this securitised response by dramatising the threat of terrorism. This amplified the fears of a potential attack to the point that it

inadvertently contributed towards lapses in security as other potential threats to public safety, including football-related violence of the type seen in Marseille, were overlooked.

The media support of securitisation was reflected in the second discussion which explored the media coverage of the incidences of football-related violence at the European Championship and the police response to it. Within this discussion, a paradox was revealed where the policy establishment and the media fed off each other but at the same time act in an adversarial way when an incident occurs and is subject to scrutiny. The scrutiny by the media was primarily of the French police and it was the theme of cultural differences which was identified and utilised by a number of media outlets to critique the French police approach.

The theme of cultural differences was used by various media outlets to demonstrate that the French police approach lacked a coherent security strategy to deal with the various threats that the European Championship faced. By cross-examining the French approach, with the British and Portuguese policing approaches, the media highlighted the robust zero-tolerance nature of the French police response which amplified the perceived injustices that football fans faced, this collectively unified football fans in opposition to the police. It also demonstrated that the French police had limited capacity to deal with the perceived lesser threats.

The final discussion examined the media coverage in the aftermath of these incidences of football-related violence. Focusing on the themes of sensationalisation and media amplification in relation to the political and sporting body responses received from representatives of Britain and Russia, it was apparent that the media was highly influential in framing the perception of the phenomenon at elite level and for the general public. This led to both the political and footballing establishment of the two states using the media as a platform to vindicate themselves and apportion the blame elsewhere.

Therefore, the coverage throughout the European Championship was a demonstration that the media was heavily influential in framing the perception and discussion of football-related violence. By supporting and fuelling a problematic securitised response, the media turned the focus to the threat of terrorism. This focus on the threat of terrorism saw other potential threats to fan safety overlooked, including football-related violence. The media coverage which focused on the incidences of violence, the robust police response and the elite responses from the two states, all in turn, amplified the phenomenon and raised the salience of the issue of football-

related violence. Whether this will result in future tournament planners taking this potential threat to fan safety as seriously as it should be remains to be seen.

An analysis of football-related violence by England and Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

Conclusion

Following an in-depth exploration of the current literature on football-related violence, this project has provided an analysis of media portrayals of football-related violence by England and Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship, through the analysis of a selection of print media sources, drawn from liberal, centrist and conservative media outlets. This discussion is informed by the narrow range of the source base, this, therefore, hinders the broader generalisability of these findings and the observations that have been made. However, these observations do have wider implications as potential future avenues of research.

The first observation is related to the relationship between the media and the theme of securitisation and the impact that had on the continental tournament. In the build-up to Euro 2016, there was a demonstration of the precautions put in place for any major sporting event in the post 9/11 climate (King & Sharp, 2006) as there was, across the liberal, centrist and conservative divide, a notable ideological convergence (Maynard & Mildenberger, 2015) amongst the media outlets in support of a securitised response. However, as this observation is based on a particular sample this hinders the extent to which this observation can be applied in other settings, further research of a larger sample would be needed to do so.

The manifestation of this ideological convergence was the intersubjective establishment of terrorism as the perceived existential threat (Waever, 2004). Through raising awareness of potential threats at Euro 2016, the media used its influence to amplify (Hall, 1978) fear which fuelled and supported the securitised response undertaken. This support of the securitised response inadvertently contributed towards lapses in security, as football-related violence and other potential threats to public safety were overlooked.

The other major observation that emerges from the sources which may be an avenue for further research is that, through the themes of amplification and sensationalisation (Hall, 1978), the influence of the media is apparent throughout the European Championship coverage. In the aftermath of the incidences of football-related violence, the response of Britain and Russia was an inadvertent demonstration of this as elites from both, the political establishment and the sporting bodies of both states, attempted to use the media to their advantage. The mass media was, therefore, used by elites as a platform to apportion blame away from their own state to their opponents and even the media, as a means of vindication (Walker, 2016a) (Walker,

An analysis of football-related violence by England and
Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

2016b) (Taylor, 2016). This observation also highlights a limit of this research as the themes selected reflected the elite perspective which inadvertently led to there being less scope for grassroot perspectives providing an alternative explanation as to why football-related violence occurred at the European Championships.

This and the paradoxical relationship between the mass media and the policy establishment leads to this project's position that, through amplification, the 2016 European Championship was a demonstration of the influence that the media holds to frame the perception and discussion of football-related violence at elite level as well as for the general population.

Therefore, whilst this project has offered a contribution to the literature by analysing football-related violence and its relationship with the media, the themes explored throughout this project link to broader over-arching issues, some of which go beyond football-related violence, which could be explored as part of further research.

The first of the broader issues is securitisation. The media's overt support of a securitised response was demonstrated throughout Euro 2016 and the role the media played fuelling a securitised response through the dramatisation of terrorism, which was highlighted in this project, is an issue which could be explored further in relation to other media coverage of previous major sporting and non-sporting events as part of a comparative case study.

Another broader issue, that emerged from the findings, is the relationship between the media and the policy establishment and the resultant paradox. This issue like the relationship between the media and securitisation, is not limited to just the context of football-related violence, it can be explored outright. Similarly, building on the paradoxical relationship between the media and the policy establishment, the intricate relationship between elites and the media which leads to the former attempting to take advantage of the latter, as a platform for vindication and self-justification, could be explored in greater depth as part of a broader research project.

Finally, this project has highlighted and analysed the media cross-examination of the French police approach which included comparisons being drawn, with other successful approaches including Britain and Portugal. However, there is scope for a cross-national case study of different policing approaches across continental Europe, this also could go beyond the parameters of crowd safety issues and the policing of major sporting events.

Bibliography

Adang, O. & Cuvelier, C. (2001). Policing Euro 2000: International police co-operation, information management and police deployment. In Police Academy of the Netherlands, Apeldoorn, Retrieved from
http://policestudies.homestead.com/files/Adang_Cuvelier_Policing_Euro_2000.pdf.

Armstrong, J. (2016, March 13). More than 1,100 hooligans free to travel to Euro 2016 after banning orders expire. Daily Mirror. Retrieved from
http://www.mirror.co.uk/sport/football/news/more-1100-hooligans-free-travel-7551386

Armstrong, G. (1998). Football Hooligans: Knowing the Score. Oxford: Berg.

Armstrong, G. & Giulianotti, R. (2002). Avenues of contestation. Football hooligans running and ruling urban spaces. Social Anthropology, 10 (2), 211-238.

Atak, K. & della Porta, D. (2016). Popular uprisings in Turkey: Police culpability and constraints on dialogue-oriented policing in Gezi Park and beyond. European Journal of Criminology, 13 (5), 610-625. doi: 10.1177/1477370816636902.

Bairner, A. (2006). The Leicester School and the Study of Football Hooliganism. Sport in Society, 9 (4), 583-598.

Balzacq, T. (2015). The 'Essence' of securitization: Theory, ideal type, and a sociological science of security. International Relations, 29 (1), 103-113.

Barbour, R.S. (2014). Introducing qualitative research: a student's guide (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: SAGE.

Barroso, J. & Sandelowski, M. (2003). Classifying the Findings in Qualitative Studies. Qualitative Health Research, 13 (7), 905-923.

Batchelor, T. (2016, June 15). Euro 2016 terror threat: Two ISIS cells en route to France to launch attack, police warn. The Express. Retrieved from

An analysis of football-related violence by England and Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

http://www.express.co.uk/news/world/680091/Euro-2016-terror-warning-police-ISIS-fighters-heading-Europe-carry-out-attacks

Barlow, M. (2016, June 11). Russia striker Artem Dzyuba plays down Euro 2016 violence and insists the trouble with England fans was '50/50'. Daily Mail. Retrieved from http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sport/football/article-3640928/Russia-striker-Artem-Dzyuba-plays-Euro-2016-violence-insists-not-street-fighting-championship-here.html#ixzz4hLQwMZQV

BBC. (1998). Sport: Football Alcohol ban for England match. Retrieved from http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sport/football/119564.stm.

Berelson, B. (1952). Content analysis in communication research. New York: Glencoe.

Best, S. (2010). The Leicester School of Football Hooliganism: an evaluation. Soccer & Society, 11 (5), 573-587.

Blaxter, L., Hughes, C., & Tight, M. (2010). How to research (4th ed.). Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Boffey, D. (2016, June 12). Euro 2016: England and Russia fans clash before and after match. The Guardian. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/football/2016/jun/11/euro-2016-french-police-tactics-raise-fears-of-more-clashes-with-england-fans

Bryman, A. (2014). Social research methods (4th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burnham, P. (2008). Research methods in politics (2nd ed.). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Buzan, B. & Waever, O. (2009). Macrosecuritisation and security constellations: reconsidering scale in securitisation theory. Review of International Studies, 35, 253-276.

Buzan, B., Waever, O., & de Wilde, J. (1997). Security: A New Framework for Analysis. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Canter, D., Comber, M., & Uzzell, D. (1989). Football in Its Place: An Environmental Psychology

of Football Grounds. London: Routledge.

Collins, T. (2005). History, Theory and the 'Civilizing Process'. Sport in History, 25 (2), 289-306.

Clarke, J. (1973). Football Hooliganism and the Skinheads. (Department of Cultural Studies). Retrieved from http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-artslaw/history/cccs/stencilled-occasional-papers/1to8and11to24and38to48/SOP42.pdf

Clarke, J. (1978). Football and working class fans: tradition and change. In R. Ingham (Ed.) Football Hooliganism- the wider context (pp. 37-61). London: Inter-Action Inprint.

Council of Europe (2005). European Convention on Spectator Violence and Misbehaviour at Sports events and in particular at Football Matches (T-RV)- Portuguese Report on Lessons Learnt from EURO 2004. Retrieved from https://www.coe.int/t/dg4/sport/Source/T-RV/T-RV_2005_INF04_EN_Portuguese_report_lessons_learnt_EURO2004.pdf

Denver, D. & Garnett, M. (2014). British General Elections Since 1964: Diversity, Dealignment, and Disillusion. Oxford: OUP Oxford.

Dunn, M. (2016, June 15). Russia responds to Euro 2016 fan clashes as petition launches to move 2018 World Cup. The Express. Retrieved from http://www.express.co.uk/sport/euro-2016/679822/Euro-2016-Russia-Fans-Violence-Reaction-Petition-FIFA-World-Cup-2018-England-Wales-News

Dunning, E. (2000). Towards a Sociological Understanding of Football Hooliganism as a World Phenomenon. European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research, 8 (2), 141-162.

Dunning, E. & Elias, N. (Eds.) (1971). The Sociology of Sport: A Selection of Readings. London: Cass.

Dunning, E., Murphy, P., Waddington, I., & Astrinakis, A.E. (Eds.) (2002). Fighting Fans: Football Hooliganism as a World Phenomenon. Dublin: University College Dublin Press.

Dunning, E., Murphy, P.J., & Williams, J. (1988). The Roots of Football Hooliganism. London: Routledge.

Elo, S. & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. Journal of Advanced Nursing, 62 (1), 107-115. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x.

European Parliament (1996). Resolution on hooliganism and the free movement of football supporters. (51996IP0124). Retrieved from http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:51996IP0124&from=EN

Frosdick, S. & Marsh, P. (2005). Football Hooliganism. Devon: Willan.

George, A.L. & Bennett, A. (2005). Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences. London: MIT Press.

Goudsblom, J. (1994). The Theory of the Civilizinq Process and Its Discontents. In School for Social Science, Amsterdam, Retrieved from http://www.norberteliasfoundation.nl/docs/pdf/GoudsblomDiscontents.pdf.

Giulianotti, R. (1999). Football- a sociology of the global game. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Grbich, C. (2007). Qualitative data analysis: an introduction. London: SAGE.

Hall, S. (1978). The treatment of 'football hooliganism' in the press. In R. Ingham (Ed.) 'Football Hooliganism'- the wider context (pp. 15-37). London: Inter-Action Inprint.

Hansen, A. (1998). Mass communication research methods. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Harré, R. & Secord, P.F. (1972). The Explanation of Social Behaviour. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Harrington, J.A. & Trethowan, W.H. (1968). Soccer Hooliganism (Preliminary Report). Birmingham Research Group, Birmingham.

Harrison, L. (2001). Political research: an introduction. London: Routledge.

An analysis of football-related violence by England and Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

Herbert, I. (2016a, June 12). Euro 2016: England fans must look at themselves after Marseille violence – their behaviour is an embarrassment. The Independent. Retrieved from http://www.independent.co.uk/sport/football/international/euro-2016-england-fans-must-look-at-themselves-after-marseille-violence-their-conduct-is-an-a7077911.html

Herbert, I. (2016c, June 11). Euro 2016: England fans urged not to provoke police who are already dealing with terror threat as clashes continue. The Independent. Retrieved from http://www.independent.co.uk/sport/football/international/euro-2016-england-fans-urged-not-to-provoke-police-who-are-already-dealing-with-terror-threat-as-a7076981.html

Herbert, I. (2016d, June 16). Euro 2016: England fans face a return to riot police tactics of the 1980s, British officers warn. The Independent. Retrieved from http://www.independent.co.uk/sport/football/international/euro-2016-england-fans-face-a-return-to-riot-police-tactics-of-the-1980s-british-officers-warn-a7086396.html

Herbert, I. (2016, June 14). Euro 2016: 'The English were no angels, it was 50:50,' Russia striker Artem Dzyuba says of Marseille violence. The Independent. Retrieved from http://www.independent.co.uk/sport/football/international/euro-2016-the-english-were-no-angels-it-was-5050-russia-striker-artem-dzyuba-says-of-marseille-a7081531.html

Hoggart, R. (1992). The uses of literacy: aspects of working class life with special reference to publications and entertainments (2nd ed.). London: Penguin.

Holsti, O.R. (1969). Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities. Reading: Addison-Wesley.

Horak, R. (1991). Things change: trends in Austrian football hooliganism from 1977–1990. The Sociological Review, 39 (3), 531-548.

Hsieh, H.F. & Shannon, S.E. (2005). Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis. Qualitative Health Research, 15 (9), 1277-1288. doi: 10.1177/1049732305276687.

Hughes, L. (2016, June 7). British football fans warned Euro 2016 stadiums are 'potential

targets' for terrorist attacks. The Telegraph. Retrieved from
http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/06/07/british-football-fans-warned-euro-2016-stadiums-
are-potential-ta/

Jackson, J. (2015, November 14). Euro 2016 organisers facing up to growing terrorism risk to
finals. The Guardian. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/football/2015/nov/14/euro-
2016-finals-terrorism-risk

Jackson, R., Jarvis, L., & Gunning, J. (2011). Terrorism: A Critical Introduction. Basingstoke:
Palgrave Macmillan.

Jones, D.M. & Smith, M.L.R. (2016, June 21). Is Vladimir Putin orchestrating Russian football
hooligans to push Britain out of the EU?. The Telegraph. Retrieved from
http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/06/21/is-vladimir-putin-orchestrating-russian-football-
hooligans-to-pu/

King, A.C. (2002). The End of the Terraces: Transformation of English Football in the 1990s.
New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

King, M. & Sharp, D. (2006). Global Security and Policing Change: The Impact of 'Securitisation'
on Policing in England and Wales. Police Practice and Research, 7 (5), 379-390. doi:
10.1080/15614260601076025.

Konrad, L. (1966). On Aggression. London: Routledge.

Krippendorff, K. (2013). Content analysis: an introduction to its methodology (3rd ed.). London:
SAGE.

Landauro, I. & Robinson, J. (2016, June 12). French Police Strive to Contain Euro 2016
Violence; UEFA to investigate Russian soccer body after violence at Euro 2016. Wall Street
Journal. Retrieved from https://www.wsj.com/articles/uefa-to-investigate-russian-soccer-body-
after-violence-at-euro-2016-1465731820

Lewis, R. (2014). Football Hooliganism Revisited: A Belated Reply to Patrick Murphy, Eric

Dunning and Joseph Maguire. The International Journal of the History of Sport, 31 (9), 1062-1080.

Lewis, M. & McDaid, S. (2017). Bosnia on the Border? Republican Violence in Northern Ireland During the 1920s and 1970s. Terrorism and Political Violence, 29 (4), 635-655.

Marsh, P. (1978a). Life and careers on the soccer terraces. In R. Ingham (Ed.) Football Hooliganism- the wider context (pp. 61-83). London: Inter-Action Inprint.

Marsh, P. (1978b). Aggro, the Illusion of Violence. London: Dent.

Matthews, B. & Ross, L. (2010). Research methods: a practical guide for the social sciences. Harlow: Longman.

Marx, K. (1964) Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844. New York City: International Publishers.

Maynard, J.L. & Mildenberger, M. (2015 September). Convergence and Divergence in the Study of Ideology: A Critical Review.

Moore, F. & Oliphant, V. (2016, June 10). The Daily Express. Retrieved from https://www.express.co.uk/news/world/678587/euros-tear-gas-english-fans-marseille. The Daily Express. Retrieved from https://www.express.co.uk/news/world/678587/euros-tear-gas-english-fans-marseille

Moore-Bridger, B. (2016, June 14). MP Damian Collins: 'Russia must control its fans or be stripped of 2018 World Cup'. The Evening Standard. Retrieved from http://www.standard.co.uk/news/world/mp-damian-collins-russia-must-control-its-fans-or-be-stripped-of-2018-world-cup-a3271191.html

Murphy, P.J., Williams, J., & Dunning, E. (1990). Football on Trial: Spectator Violence and Development in the Football World: Spectator Violence and Developments in the Football World. New York: Routledge.

An analysis of football-related violence by England and Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

Neuman, W.L. (2011). Social research methods: qualitative and quantitative approaches (7th ed.). London: Pearson Education.

Newburn, T., Diski, R., Cooper, K., Deacon, R., Burch, A., & Grant, M. (2016). 'The biggest gang'? police and people in the 2011 england riots. Policing and Society, 1-18. doi:10.1080/10439463.2016.1165220

Owen, J. (2016, June 13). French police losing the fight against football hooligans at Euro 2016. The Express. Retrieved from http://www.express.co.uk/news/world/679172/French-police-losing-the-fight-against-football-hooligans-at-Euro-2016

Owen, S. (Ed.) (2008). Richard Hoggart and Cultural Studies. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Patomäki, H. (2015). Absenting the absence of future dangers and structural transformations in securitization theory. International Relations, 29 (1), 128-136.

Pearson, G. (2016, June 13). Poor police tactics are the real culprits. The Times. Retrieved from http://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/poor-police-tactics-are-the-real-culprits-cfkqnf7q7

Pierce, R. (2008). Research methods in politics: a practical guide. London: SAGE.

Punch, M. (2005). Introduction to Social Research: Quantitative and qualitative approaches (2nd ed.). London: SAGE.

Rowland, J. (2001). Policing European Football Hooliganism (Degree Dissertation). The Politics of Policing Transnational Crime, University of Exeter.

Richardson, J.E. (2007). Analysing newspapers: an approach from critical discourse analysis. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rivet, M., Love, B., & Lough, R. (2016). French riot police disperse English and Russian fans in Marseille. Retrieved from http://uk.reuters.com/article/uk-soccer-euro-security-marseille-idUKKCN0YW0GS.

Roberts, G.K. (1972). What is comparative politics?. London: Macmillan.

Quintaneiro, T. (2006). The concept of figuration or configuration in Norbert Elias' sociological theory. Teor.soc, 2, 1-13.

Schmitt, C. (2007). The Concept of the Political: Expanded Edition (3rd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Short, J.F. & Hughes, L.A. (Eds.) (2006). Studying Youth Gangs (Violence Prevention and

Policy). Lanha: Altamira Press.

Spaaij, R. (2007). Football hooliganism as a transnational phenomenon: Past and present analysis: A critique – More specificity and less generality. The International Journal of the History of Sport, 24 (4), 411-431.

Suttle, G.D. (1970). The Social Order of the Slums. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.

TASS. (2015). Mutko: Russia faces attempt to be slammed, but politics shouldn't be mixed up with sports. Retrieved from http://tass.com/sport/836667.

Taylor, I. (1971a). Soccer Consciousness and Soccer Hooliganism. In S. Cohen (Ed.) Images of Deviance (pp. 134-165). New York: Pelican.

Taylor, I. (1971b). "Football Mad": A Speculative Sociology of Football Hooliganism. In E. Dunning (Ed.) The Sociology of Sport (pp. 352-378). London: Cass.

Taylor, D. (2016, June 14). Euro 2016: FA's Greg Dyke lambasts Uefa failings in Marseille and fears violence in Lille. The Guardian. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/football/2016/jun/13/fa-letter-greg-dyke-uefa-england-russia-football-violence

Temple, M. (2008). The British Press. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

The Economist. (2016). Organisers of Euro 2016 expected trouble. But not like this: Football hooliganism. Retrieved from http://www.economist.com/blogs/gametheory/2016/06/football-hooliganism.

The Week. (2016). Euro 2016 football violence: How the Russian media reacted. Retrieved from http://www.theweek.co.uk/euro-2016/73548/euro-2016-football-violence-how-the-russian-media-reacted

Tilly, C. (2004). Social Boundary Mechanisms. Philosophy of the Social Sciences, 34 (2), 211-236. doi: 10.1177/0048393103262551.

Waever, O. (2004). Aberystwyth, Paris, Copenhagen New 'Schools' in Security Theory and their Origins between Core and Periphery. In Montreal, Retrieved from http://citation.allacademic.com//meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/0/7/4/4/6/pages74461/p74461-1.php.

Waever, O. (2011). Politics, security, theory. Security Dialogue, 42 (4-5), 465-480.

Wagg, S. & Williams, J. (Eds.) (1991). British Football and Social Change: Getting into Europe. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Walker, S. (2016a, June 13). Moscow football official to violent fans: well done lads, keep it up!. The Guardian. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/football/2016/jun/13/moscow-football-official-to-violent-fans-well-done-lads-keep-it-up

Walker, S. (2016b, June 13). Russian officials blame security for problems and praise fighting fans. The Guardian. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/football/2016/jun/13/russia-officials-fan-violence-marseille-england

Walt, V. (2016). France to Kick off Euro 2016 Under Shadow of Terror Threat. Retrieved from http://time.com/4361317/euro-2016-france-terror-threat/

Weaver, M. (2016, June 10). French police tactics could lead to more Euro 2016 violence: expert. The Guardian. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/football/2016/jun/10/french-police-tactics-marseille-more-euro-2016-violence-expert

Williams, M.C. (2015). Securitization as political theory: The politics of the extraordinary. International Relations, 29 (1), 114-120.

Zulaika, J. (2009). Terrorism: The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

An analysis of football-related violence by England and Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship

<u>Appendices</u>

<u>Copyright Statement</u>

i. The author of this thesis (including any appendices and/ or schedules to this thesis) owns any copyright in it (the "Copyright") and s/he has given The University of Huddersfield the right to use such Copyright for any administrative, promotional, educational and/or teaching purposes.

ii. Copies of this thesis, either in full or in extracts, may be made only in accordance with the regulations of the University Library. Details of these regulations may be obtained from the Librarian. Details of these regulations may be obtained from the Librarian. This page must form part of any such copies made.

iii. The ownership of any patents, designs, trademarks and any and all other intellectual property rights except for the Copyright (the "Intellectual Property Rights") and any reproductions of copyright works, for example graphs and tables ("Reproductions"), which may be described in this thesis, may not be owned by the author and may be owned by third parties. Such Intellectual Property Rights and Reproductions cannot and must not be made available for use without permission of the owner(s) of the relevant Intellectual Property Rights and/or Reproductions.

An analysis of football-related violence by England and Russia fans during the 2016 European Championship